



MR. BRYAN AND HIS GRANDCHILDREN

THE REAL BRYAN

BEING EXTRACTS FROM THE SPEECHES
AND WRITINGS OF
"A WELL-ROUNDED MAN"

They call a man a statesman whose ear is tuned to catch the slightest pulsation of a pocket-book, and denounce as a demagogue anyone who dares listen to the heart-beat of humanity.—W. J. Bryan.

COMPILED BY
RICHARD L. METCALFE

PERSONAL HELP PUBLISHING COMPANY
DES MOINES, IOWA
1908

Contents

	PAGE
A Badge of Shame	114
A Central Bank	138
A Child's Influence	124
"A Dream in Marble"	121
A Far-Reaching Platform	23
A High Purpose	48
A Living Fountain	86
American Foreign Missions	174
Americanism	34
American Money Abroad	84
American Philanthropy	44
America's Mission	181
Anarchy	140
"Ask the Mother"	31
A World Power	36
Before the Economic Club, New York	275
Before the Irish Club	199
Business Honor	45
Campaign Contributions	162
Capital and Labor	212
Employer and Employee	212
Arbitration	215
Labor and "Property Rights"	216
Representation in the Cabinet	217
Their Share in Prosperity	218
Education and the Laboring Man	219
Government by Injunction	220
Chinese Exclusion	171
Civilization	32
Class Hatred	25
Confucianism	67
Conscience	183
Coronation of a King	43
Criminal Speculation	95
Death	71
Defeat	34

	PAGE
Democracy	32
Destiny	77
Development of the Individual	23
Doctrine of Election	120
Dreamers	134
Duty of Superior Nations	37
Education	78
Election of United States Senators	139
Enforcing the Law	27
Faith	133
Force	81
Foreign Relations	153
Entangling Alliances	153
The Monroe Doctrine	154
Collecting Debts with Navy	154
Fraternity	28
Free Speech	56
Gambling, Great and Small	166
Gambling on Futures	166
The Gambling Vice	169
Stock Exchange Gambling	171
Graft	53
Growth of Democracy	99
Guaranteed Banks	223
The Plan Outlined	223
"Make All Banks Equally Good"	225
Humanity's Search for Peace	130
Imitation	66
Immortality	39
Imperialism, Militarism and Self-Government	245
Imperialism	245
Colonialism	251
Self-Government	251
Liberty	252
Militarism	253
Cubans and Filipinos	253
Income Tax	160
Individualism vs. Socialism	186
In the Philippines	155
Jerusalem	45
Love's Festival	92
"Loyalty to the Money Bag"	55
Majestic Nature	33
Man's Limitations	123
Markham's Tribute to Lincoln	83
Miracles	85
Misrepresenting the Democrat	102

CONTENTS

5

	PAGE
Money and Banking	239
Wall Street and the Treasury	239
An Attribute of Sovereignty	240
Asset Currency	241
Motherhood	41
Oratory	111
Patriotism	142
Paying What We Owe	61
Peace	144
Pensions	137
Plutocracy	57
Presidential Nomination	149
Protecting Property Rights	114
Purity in Politics	103
Real Greatness	132
Religious Liberty	30
Revenge	58
Secret Influence	91
“Sermons in Stones”	68
Service	87
Socialism	191
State and Nation	203
The Dual Scheme	203
Advantages of the Dual System	204
Influence of the State	206
Jefferson's Reasons	207
Sphere of the State	209
Swollen Fortunes	158
Tarifa	42
Thanksgiving	54
The Ballot	24
The Buzzard and the Bee	98
The Children's Legacy	128
The Dignity of Labor	26
The Doctrines of the Nazarene	108
The Efficacy of Example	96
The First Voter	116
The Flag	75
The Greater Man and Nation	59
The Ideal Republic	74
The Law of Rewards	194
The Mount of Beatitudes	64
The Mysteries of Nature	38
The Paramount Issue	192
The Presidency	146
The Real Defenders of Property	179
The Scholar in Government	50

	PAGE
The Secret of Life	126
The Spring as an Illustration	80
The Tariff	255
"Fat Frying"	255
Two Arguments	257
The Great Home Industry	259
Business and the Tariff	261
That Tariff Commission	261
The Tomb of Napoleon	89
The Twenty-third Psalm	63
The Vice-Presidency	151
The Wise Age	49
"Thou Shalt Not Steal"	297
Three Kinds of Government	47
Tolstoy	42
Tribute to Jefferson	118
Trusts, Corporations and Railroad Regulation	263
"Good and Bad" Trusts	263
Railroad Regulation	264
Corporations	265
Trusts	266
Private Monopoly	273
Two Systems	70
Union	105
Valuable Assets	44
War	35
"What is the Explanation of Bryan"	9
Wm. J. Bryan—A Well-Rounded Man	19
Winning by Justice	52

Foreword

It is not possible in so small a volume as this to quote, from Mr. Bryan's speeches, all of the paragraphs that are entitled to rank as eloquent and instructive. The selections have been made with the view of showing the wide range taken by Nebraska's distinguished citizen in his public addresses; and showing, also, that the same high ideals controlling his political conduct rule in other affairs of life.

If, through the perusal of this little volume, those men and women who have been taught false notions concerning Mr. Bryan, learn that he is a true and manly man who believes that the gifts with which Nature has endowed him are veritable commands to render service to his fellows, then they will know "the real Bryan;" then they will know him even as he is known by every Nebraska neighbor who has had the advantage of intimate acquaintance with the man.

R. L. M.

“What is the Explanation of Bryan?”

“Will some one please stand up and explain this man Bryan—the Phoenix who arises from the ashes of defeat stronger, better loved than ever?” This question was asked by a Pittsburg, Pa., man in a letter printed in the Christian Union Herald. This man had seen (to use his own language) “a wonderful thing come to pass.” He had seen William J. Bryan “flouted by us easterners as a wild-eyed disturber of the peace” entering Pittsburg, “a city which gave the biggest comparative majority against him of all cities in the nation and greeted by an enormous crowd with an attention and enthusiasm that passeth description, holding them under spell of his marvelous eloquence for more than two long mortal hours and sending them away cheering—and thinking.”

“All this, mark you,” said the Pittsburg man, “in the city of Pittsburg—intensely republican, ‘conservative,’ tariff-loving Pittsburg!—the stronghold and center alike of his democratic and republican enemies! If this can occur in Pittsburg, what must be his hold upon the people in communities where the what-is-is-right doctrine is not revered as here!”

From these scenes the Pittsburg man turned and in utter perplexity asked, “What is the explanation of Bryan?”

“What is the explanation of Bryan?” asked the Pittsburg man and then he added: “A magazine writer attempted recently to explain him, but when the article was finished all he had proved was that Bryan has made a few honest dollars out of his political career, though the writer did not sufficiently emphasize the phenomenon that a political career has at last resulted in an honest if comparatively small fortune. Bigger fortunes than Bryan’s have been made through political careers before now, but we are never tempted to describe them as ‘honest.’”

“What is the explanation of Bryan?” asked the Pittsburg man. “Is it his honesty? There are many honest men in the nation who have not his wonderful hold on the hearts of the people. Is it his intellect? His is not the most powerful intellect in the nation, strong though it is.

“Is it his eloquence? We are still under the spell of his incomparable voice, cutting wit and forceful sentences, but we know that his eloquence does not explain him.

“Is it the romantic quality of the career that began when the editor, just returned from reporting the convention which nominated his opponent, seizing the dramatic, critical moment, thrilled several hundred men into nominating an obscure lawyer and writer to the highest office in the land? Hardly!”

Nor in the opinion of this Pittsburger is the explanation to be found in the combination of all four of the suggested explanations—honesty, intellect, eloquence and the romantic quality of career. For, in

the opinion of this writer, "The combination could never have brought about the event described above in Scotch-Irish, conservative Pittsburg. We have watched and studied Pittsburg's political audiences for several years and we have never seen the like of that which greeted Bryan. No rabble, but a fine body of representative, thoughtful men; not merely curious, but attentive, with an earnest attention that was not disturbed by the magnetic attraction of his personality. They listened as men listen who have confidence in their speaker, in his sincerity and in his knowledge and in his truthfulness."

Sometimes the things for which we dig are to be found upon the surface. When the Pittsburg man said that his neighbors listened to Mr. Bryan "as men listen who have confidence in their speaker, in his sincerity and in his knowledge and in his truthfulness," he may have given the answer to his own question.

If, however, the Pittsburg writer yet finds it difficult to understand "what is the explanation of Bryan," he might approach the solution of the problem with higher hopes for results if he freed himself from some of the newspaper-made misconceptions concerning Mr. Bryan's career. It is hardly fair to say that when Mr. Bryan was nominated for the presidency in 1896, he was "an obscure lawyer and writer." Six years before his nomination for the presidency he had been nominated by the democrats as a candidate for congress in what seemed to be a hopelessly republican district. In 1888 the republican candidate had carried

that district by a large plurality. In 1890 Mr. Bryan carried that district by 6,700 plurality, although he had a populist opponent who received 13,066 votes. I think it is admitted in Nebraska that this result was largely due to the fact that Mr. Bryan and his opponent engaged in a joint debate. While the republican candidate was an able and resourceful lawyer and had committed himself to some of the reforms then growing in popular favor, Mr. Bryan plainly won the honors in a debate noted alike for its vigor and good humor.

In 1892 Mr. Bryan was re-elected, although his congressional district had been rearranged leaving it composed largely of republican counties.

During his first term—on March 16, 1892—Mr. Bryan made his great tariff speech in the House of Representatives. And on that occasion—as will hereafter be shown by witnesses that may not be said to be partisans of the Nebraskan—he became a national figure. Those who had the privilege of hearing that speech will not forget it; nor will they fail to remember the stirring scenes enacted at its close. Bryan began his address at 2:30 o'clock in the afternoon and closed at 5:30.

Over the report of that speech the New York World carried the following headlines:

“Bryan Downed Them All.”

“Nebraska’s Young Congressman Scores a Triumph in the House.”

“His Maiden Speech a Brilliant Plea for Tariff Reform.”

“Mr. Raines, of New York, and Messrs. McKenna

and Lind Interrupt Him with Questions and are Silenced by Sharp Replies."

"Party Leaders Enthusiastically Applaud the Orator, and His Speech is the Talk of Washington."

Concerning that speech I now quote from the reports made by the New York World, the New York Sun, the Washington Post, the New York Herald and the New York Times.

The New York World said: "When Speaker Crisp appointed Mr. Bryan, of Nebraska, one of the committee on Ways and Means, some criticism was made on the ground that he was a new member and inexperienced in tariff legislation. But Mr. Bryan, today, in a three-hours' speech, made the biggest hit of the debate and confirmed the Speaker's judgment of his ability. No more dramatic speech has been delivered at this session. Mr. Bryan has the clear-cut features of the Randall type. He spoke without notes, and his baritone voice made the chamber ring. The republicans sought to take advantage of his inexperience in Congress by interrupting him with questions, which would have puzzled much older heads. But Mr. Bryan brightened under this friction and forced one republican after another into his seat. Old campaigners of the Reed school, like Raines, of New York, and McKenna, of California, found the young Nebraskan more than their match. A lawyer by profession, Mr. Bryan argued his case with a dramatic directness that aroused not only the enthusiasm of the democrats, but won the applause of the galleries. When Mr. Bryan finished, the galleries applauded for fully five min-

utes, and democrats and republicans gathered about him and shook his hand warmly. This speech has been a revelation. No new member has received such an ovation in years. Mr. Bryan's speech was the talk of the town to-night."

The Washington Post said: "If, like Byron, Congressman Bryan, of Nebraska, does not wake this morning and find himself famous, then all the eulogies that were being passed on him in hotel corridors were meaningless. There was hardly anything else talked about, except the wonderfully brilliant speech of the young Nebraskan of the House."

The New York Sun said: "William Jennings Bryan, the young democratic leader from Nebraska, whom Speaker Crisp placed on the Ways and Means Committee against the protest of a large element in the House, distinguished himself today by making the 'star' speech of the present session on the tariff question. Mr. Bryan astonished his associates and the occupants of the crowded galleries by an exhibition of finished oratory seldom witnessed in the halls of Congress. He is only thirty years old, is tall and well built, with a clean-shaven face and jet black hair. Charley O'Neil, the father of the House, as he is called, says Mr. Bryan looks something as the late Samuel Jackson Randall looked twenty-five years ago. An hour was given Mr. Bryan to speak, but when that time elapsed there was a general chorus of 'Go on, go on,' from both sides of the House. Members lingered in their seats and the spectators remained in the galleries till 5:12 o'clock, so intent were they in hearing the young orator from

the West. Not only was he logical, but he was practical, and won for himself a place among the House orators beside the silver-toned Breckinridge, of Kentucky, or the calm-voiced Henderson of Iowa."

The New York Herald said: "As Mr. Bryan took his seat he was the recipient of hearty congratulations from his party colleagues. Although this was his maiden speech, he showed every quality of a fine orator. No member who has addressed the House thus far upon the tariff question has received the same attention which was accorded to the young Nebraskan."

The New York Times said: "For most of the time since the tariff battle in the House began, the democrats have been attacking the republicans' position largely with oratorical firecrackers. Some of these explosives made a merry crackling, but not enough of it fully to wake up the deliberate body, and certainly not enough fully to arrest the attention of many persons out of the House. Today, almost with the effect of an ambushade, the democrats uncovered a ten-inch gun, and for two hours shelled the surprised enemy so effectively, that the protectionist batteries, at first manned with spirit, but supplied with very light guns, were silenced, Gunner Raines (republican, New York) coming out of the engagement with a badly-battered muzzle, and with the conviction, probably, that he would be compelled next time to put in more powder and employ newer and more modern projectiles. The man who today ceased to be a new and young unknown member, and jumped at once into the position of the best tariff speaker in ten years, was Representative

Bryan, democrat, of Nebraska. To be a representative from Nebraska implies a condition of revolution in that state; but it also means something more in the case of Mr. Bryan that was not suspected before by those who are not familiar with his reputation at home. Some of the men who supported Mills were in doubt at the time of the caucus about his soundness generally, as he was one of the four Springer men who stuck to Springer after 'the last button was off his coat,' and when the votes of the four would have elected Mills instead of Crisp. After his speech of today there can be no doubt about where he stands on the tariff question. There can be no doubt about his power of oratory and argument, and Mr. Raines, who is apt at a certain shallow sort of sophistical cross-questioning, will probably admit that Mr. Bryan is able to hold his own with a veteran in the black-horse cavalry. For two hours and a half Mr. Bryan held the floor and his audience, being urged to go on after his hour had expired, and being inspired to still further continue by shouts of 'Go on,' 'Go on,' when he indicated a modest desire to bring his long speech to a close. Having a graceful figure, a little above the average height, Mr. Bryan is not unlike Carlisle in feature, but not so spare. His face is smooth shaved and the features are strong and well marked. His voice is clear and strong, his language plain but not lacking in grace. He uses illustrations effectively, and he employs humor and sarcasm with admirable facility. 'The applause that greeted him was as spontaneous as it was genuine.'

Although Mr. Bryan's newspaper opponents have told the world that Nebraska has often recorded its political vote against him, they have not given the testimony that will be cheerfully borne by any reputable citizen of this state: That William J. Bryan has never met with political reverses, but that he was accompanied by thousands of men who, having had every opportunity for the study of the man, trusted him implicitly and admired him for the philosophy with which he met defeat, the vigor with which he waged battle and the honesty with which he defended conviction.

And these will also say that in this day Mr. Bryan is stronger in Nebraska than at any other time in his career. He has won the way to the hearts of Nebraskans—regardless of political prejudice.

If I were asked to answer the question, "What is the explanation of Bryan?" I would quote the concluding paragraph of an editorial that appeared in the Omaha Daily World-Herald during the closing hours of the congressional campaign of 1890. It was good then; it is good now:

"Nature has gifted Mr. Bryan with a remarkable face—such a face as could be carved on a coin and not be out of place. He has a physical vigor which makes his unstudied gestures forcible and emphatic. He has an eye which is by turns commanding and humorous. And he has a voice which is equally adapted to tenderness or to denunciation. All these natural gifts has William J. Bryan and to them is added a talent for research, a genius for accuracy, and a nature for truth. Let Nebraska congratulate herself on the fact

that she has an orator who possesses the physical and mental qualities to make him a remarkable man in the history of this nation. And if the World-Herald reads the stars aright, the time will come when W. J. Bryan will have a reputation which will reach far beyond Nebraska—and it will be a reputation for the performance of good deeds.”

R. L. M.

William J. Bryan—A Well-Rounded Man

(An appreciation—by John H. Atwood, Leavenworth,
Kansas.)

Primarily, Mr. Bryan is a well-rounded man. Many who have and do fill the public eye may bear inspection in their public aspects, while their private lives are best left in the shadow. Such men are like statues made to be placed in niches; the front is the front of a statesman or philosopher, while the back is but uncarved ugliness. But the Nebraskan you can view from any side, and you always see a man, a whole man. Every phase of his character will sustain study, and nothing need be slurred over in order to find all commendable.

I have known him well for nearly twenty years. In 1890 he was the young country lawyer leading the democratic forlorn hope against Congressman Connell in the First Nebraska district; a forlorn hope that his genius transformed into a victory as splendid as it was unexpected. During the campaign he was a representative to a Modern Woodman council, where he met E. E. Murphy, of Leavenworth, then and now one of the leading democrats of Kansas. Mr. Murphy was greatly taken with Mr. Bryan and invited him to be a

guest and speaker at the democratic dinner to be held that fall under the auspices of the Bandana Club of Leavenworth. The invitation was accepted, conditioned upon his being elected. He was elected, and came, and saw, and spoke and conquered, and Kansas has been his from that hour. My acquaintance with him dates from that night, and we saw each other not infrequently during the succeeding years. . . .

Mr. Bryan's judgment of himself is largely at variance with that of the world. He is generally thought of as a kind of verbal necromancer; and at times he is marvelous. But his notion as expressed to me in substance several times, is found in what he said when we were together on one occasion in Kansas City: "I don't consider myself eloquent as that word is ordinarily used. Such strength as I have as a speaker lies in two things: The people know that I am in earnest, and they can understand all I say." And, while at issue with him as to the first part of that statement, I quite agree with him in the last. Read one of his speeches analytically, and it will at once appear that simplicity and clarity are its distinguishing marks. Sesquipedality can never be charged against his speeches. All is so simple that not only he who runs may read, but the slowest thinking man can understand. Like Goldsmith's, his vocabulary is largely Saxon, the tongue of the plain people; and both have demonstrated that little Norman French or Anglicized Latin is needed to make a verbal gamut great enough for even the greatest of the lingual masters.

I have been charged with being a Bryanophile, an

unreasoning Bryan lover, but I do not think that my judgment has been unduly biased. That I am biased to a degree, I concede. I want to be biased. The man who is not biased in favor of his friend is not entitled to the friendship of that friend. But I don't think my bias blinds me. I recognize that while a mighty good man, he is still a man. One of his weaknesses, as I view his character, is its strength—to use an Irishism. He is slow to change, even when changed conditions make it at least politic and possibly wise to do so. A pretty good fault, most will say; and, indeed, just when strength of purpose becomes obstinacy, who can say? In his private business affairs, he is prudent, careful. His Scotch-Irish blood will serve as guarantee against a Bryan administration ever indulging in such a saturnalia of extravagance as has been made common by recent republican regimes.

Time has demonstrated that Bryan has generally been right on public questions.

But great as is his recognized ability—yet the foundation and keystone of his strength with the people is quarried from their faith in his honesty. The people have been surfeited with smart scamps, and cunning criminals, government grafters and senatorial short-change men—they want honest men. They want the head to be right, but more, they want the heart to be right; and that Bryan's heart beats with and for them, they know.

Bryan's notions of duty are glimpsed through what happened in 1898. I was strongly opposed to his being a soldier participant in the Spanish-American war. I

felt sure that the republican administration would not permit him to do any fighting, would compel him to be a holiday soldier, and then accuse him of being what they compelled him to be, and thus attempt to hold him up to ridicule. All this I urged upon him, but his answer was characteristic: "Don't you think a man will be kept pretty busy if he does his duty, without attempting to control all the consequences?"

Bryan's greatness is like that of Washington and Lincoln, in that ramifying every part of it is the moral element; the particles that compose it are pure.

It is said he cannot be president because the great men of the nation are rarely chosen; and as proof the disappointed ambitions of Webster, Clay and Blaine are pointed to. What of Jefferson, Jackson and Lincoln? And besides, the disappointed ones named, great as they were, yet lacked a roundness on the moral side without which the complete confidence of the people is seldom commanded. Mr. Bryan would give to the high office of president the simple dignity of the elder days, a thing that has been replaced in recent years by a cunning charlatanry. His life is clean and his purpose is pure, and for such an one the hour cries aloud. [*Extracts from a newspaper article written by Mr. Atwood, Sept. 28, 1907.*]

THE REAL BRYAN

A FAR-REACHING PLATFORM

We are interested in platforms; we attend conventions, sometimes traveling long distances; we have wordy wars over the phraseology of various planks and then we wage earnest campaigns to secure the endorsement of these platforms at the polls. But the platform given to the world by the Nazarene is more far-reaching and more comprehensive than any platform ever written by the convention of any party in any country. When He condensed into one commandment those of the ten which relate to man's duty toward his fellows and enjoined upon us the rule, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself," He presented a plan for the solution of all the problems that now vex society or may hereafter arise. Other remedies may palliate or postpone the day of settlement but this is all-sufficient and the reconciliation which it effects is a permanent one. [*From "The Prince of Peace," an address delivered by Mr. Bryan on various occasions.*]

DEVELOPMENT OF THE INDIVIDUAL

The development of the individual is never complete. Solomon describes the path of the just as "like

the shining light that shineth more and more unto the perfect day," and Holland, putting the same into verse, says:

"Heaven is not gained by a single bound.
We build the ladder by which we rise
From the lowly earth to the vaulted skies,
And mount to its summit round by round."

So, with the work of government and the work of civilization. We find an unfinished work when we arrive; we leave the work unfinished when we are called hence. Each day marks out our duty for us, and it is for us to devote ourselves to it, whatever it may be, with high purpose and unfaltering courage. Whether we live to enjoy the fruits of our efforts or lay down the work before the victory is won, we know that every well-spoken word has its influence; that no good deed is ever lost. And we know, also, that no one can count his life on earth as spent in vain, if when he departs, it can be said: "The night is darker because his light has gone out; the world is not so warm because his heart has grown cold in death." [*Address entitled "Man," delivered at Commencement Day exercises, Nebraska State University, June 15, 1905.*]

THE BALLOT

There is one citizen in this country who can prove himself unworthy of the ballot which has been given

to him, and he is the citizen who either sells it or permits it to be wrested from him under coercion. Whenever a man offers you pay for your vote he insults your manhood, and you ought to have no respect for him. And the man, who instead of insulting your manhood by an offer of purchase, attempts to intimidate you, to coerce you, insults your citizenship as well as your manhood. [*Speech in Chicago in 1896.*]

CLASS HATRED

I have sometimes been accused of arraying class against class. The man who accuses me of it has never read my speeches. I have never intentionally—and I think I can even say I never have unintentionally—said anything that could be properly construed as an attempt to array class against class. I have read many descriptions of Heaven, but I have never yet read a description of Heaven where there were two—one for the rich and one for the poor. If the rich and poor must live together forever in one heaven hereafter, can not we do something towards getting them acquainted here, so that they will not have to be introduced when they reach the other side? What are we doing to solve this question? I believe that Tolstoy is right when he says that the great trouble today—a trouble that manifests itself in all these questions—is the lack of sympathy between man and man; and for twenty-nine years, clad in the garb of a peasant

and living the simple life of a peasant, he has been preaching out unto all the world a philosophy that rests upon the doctrine "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart and thy neighbor as thyself."

[*From address entitled "Democracy's Appeal to Culture," delivered before the Alumni Association of Syracuse University at Hotel Astor, New York, Jan. 27, 1905.*]

THE DIGNITY OF LABOR

The odium which rests upon the work of the hand has exerted a baneful influence the world around. The theory that idleness is more honorable than toil—that it is more respectable to consume what others have produced than to be a producer of wealth—has not only robbed society of an enormous sum but it has created an almost impassable gulf between the leisure classes and those who support them. Tolstoy is right in asserting that most of the perplexing problems of society grow out of the lack of sympathy between man and man. Because some imagine themselves above work while others see before them nothing but a life of drudgery there is constant warring and much of bitterness. When men and women become ashamed of doing nothing and strive to give to society full compensation for all they receive from society there will be harmony between the classes.

While Europe and America have advanced far beyond the Orient in placing a proper estimate upon

those who work, even our nations have not yet fully learned the lesson that employment at some useful avocation is essential to the physical health, intellectual development and moral growth. If America and England are to meet the requirements of their high positions they must be prepared to present in the lives of their citizens examples, increasing in number, of men and women who find delight in contributing to the welfare of their fellows, and this ought not to be difficult, for every department of human activity has a fascination of its own. The agricultural colleges and industrial schools which have sprung up in so many localities are evidence that a higher ideal is spreading among the people. [*From address entitled "The White Man's Burden," delivered before The American Society, London, July 4, 1906.*]

ENFORCING THE LAW

They tell you that I will not enforce the law. My friends, the fear of these people is not that I will refuse to enforce the law; their fear is that I will enforce the law. They know that I entertain old fashioned ideas upon this subject, and that according to my ideas the big criminals should wear striped clothes as well as the little criminals. I want to say to you that I believe in enforcing the law against all classes of society; and those who believe in that policy are better friends of the government than those who would make scape-

goats of little criminals and then let the big ones run at large to run the government itself. The very men who would suffer the most from the enforcement of law are the ones who seem to be most troubled. They are not afraid that I will encourage lawlessness, but they know that, if I am elected, the trusts will not select the attorney-general. [*Address in Chicago in 1896.*]

FRATERNITY

On an occasion like this a number of themes suggest themselves. The word "fraternity" comes to us at such a time for we meet under the auspices of one of the greatest fraternities of this nation, and the hour might well be occupied in speaking of the great work that the fraternity is accomplishing throughout the world. Among the great forces that are at work drawing men closer together, teaching them to recognize the tie that binds each to every other, the fraternity occupies an important place. And the virtues upon which the fraternity rests—any of these would furnish an appropriate theme. The equality that is taught in the lodge room would in itself justify the existence of the fraternity, especially at this time when we need to learn over and over again that the worth of the individual depends not upon what he possesses, or upon distinguished lineage but upon the manner in which he performs the responsibilities that rest upon him; and our fraternity teaches this idea of equality. Hos-

pitality is one of the virtues of our fraternity, and I think I can say without offending those who belong to other fraternities of which I am a member, that no fraternity in this land is more distinguished for hospitality. At home we can measure a man by what we know of him, and his position can rest upon his merits. But when a stranger comes among us we must assume the existence of virtues before we have an opportunity to test them; and throughout this land the homes that have been established by the Elks have the latch string ever out. And no order that exists among us extends a more cordial welcome to the visiting brother, or shows to him a more constant courtesy and care.

Charity is a virtue and this fraternity is conspicuous for what it does in the name of sweet charity. And it is a gracious thing in this fraternity that while it gives, gives willingly, and gives freely, it does not record the name of the one to whom it gives, that no humiliation shall ever come to one who has been the recipient of this fraternity's bounty. In charity no other order surpasses ours.

Brotherly love is another virtue upon which one might dwell today. For brotherly love lies back of equality and hospitality, and charity. It is the idea of brotherly love that the fraternity everywhere is attempting to teach, and it is this idea of brotherly love which growing, as I believe it is growing throughout the world, is cementing mankind more and more closely together. And it is this brotherly love which in my judgment is going to throw a light upon our pathway, and make it easier for us to distinguish the

duties which we owe one to another. [*From address delivered at Elk's Lodge of Sorrow, Lincoln, Neb., Dec. 2, 1906.*]

RELIGIOUS LIBERTY

Democracy is indifferent to pedigree—it deals with the individual rather than with his ancestors. Democracy ignores differences in wealth—neither riches nor poverty can be invoked in behalf of or against any citizen. Democracy knows no creed—recognizing the right of each individual to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience; it welcomes all to a common brotherhood and guarantees equal treatment to all, no matter in what church or through what forms they commune with their Creator. [*Letter of acceptance in 1896.*]

I find that I am recalling more and more frequently a story which I heard when I was a boy; it has really had a great deal of influence in shaping my views on church questions. It was in a southern Methodist church that I heard it. The minister said that there was a mill, and that many people brought wheat to the mill by several roads. When they arrived with the wheat—some coming by one road and some by another—some over the hill and some along the stream—the miller never asked them by what road they came, but simply whether the wheat was good.

That was years ago, but I have thought of that story many, many times, and it has made me feel that if we are one in the essentials we can afford to be charitable towards each other in the non-essentials, and all the branches of the Christian church are one in the great fundamental principles of religion. [*From address entitled "Democracy's Appeal to Culture," delivered before the Alumni Association of Syracuse University at Hotel Astor, New York, Jan. 27, 1905.*]

"ASK THE MOTHER"

Ask the mother who holds in her arms her boy, what her ideal is concerning him and she will tell you that she desires that his heart may be so pure that it could be laid upon a pillow and not leave a stain; that his ambition may be so holy that it could be whispered in an angel's ear; and that his life may be so clean that his mother, his sister, his wife, his child could read a record of its every thought and act without a blush. But ask her if she will require this perfection in her son before she showers her love upon him, and she will answer "No." She will tell you that she will make him as good as she can; that she will follow his footsteps with a daily prayer; that in whatever land he wanders her blessing will abide with him; and that when he dies she'll hope, hope, yet hope that the world will be better that he has lived. This is all that she can do. All that any of us can do for ourselves or for

others is the best that opportunity and circumstances permit. [*From address entitled "Man," delivered at Commencement Day exercises, Nebraska State University, June 15, 1905.*]

DEMOCRACY

A democrat may be pardoned for cherishing a high regard for the land that coined the word, democracy. The derivation of the word—from *demos*, the people, and *kratein*, to rule—makes it an appropriate one to describe a government based upon popular will. And as governments more and more recognize the citizen as the sovereign and the people as the source of all political power, the world's debt to Greece will be more and more fully appreciated. She not only gave to language a word accurately expressing the idea of self-government, but she proved by experience the wisdom of trusting the people with the management of all public affairs. [*From letter on Greece.*]

CIVILIZATION

If civilization can be defined—and I know of no better definition—as the harmonious development of the human race, physically, mentally and morally, then each individual, whether his influence is perceptible or not, raises the level of the civilization of his

age just in proportion as he contributes to the world's work a body, a mind and a heart capable of maximum effort. No one lives unto himself or dies unto himself. The tie that binds each human being to every other human being is one that can not be severed. We can not without blame invite a physical weakness that can be avoided or continue one which can be remedied. The burdens to be borne are great enough to tax the resources of all when service is rendered under the most favorable conditions; no one has a right to offer less than the best within his power. [*Address entitled "Man," delivered at Commencement Day exercises, Nebraska State University, June 15, 1905.*]

MAJESTIC NATURE

How puny seems the works of man when brought into comparison with majestic nature! His groves, what pigmies when measured against the virgin forest! His noblest temples, how insignificant when contrasted with the masonry of the hills! What canvas can imitate the dawn and sunset? What inlaid work can match the mosaics of the mountains?

Is it blind chance that gives these glimpses of the sublime? And was it blind chance that clustered vast reservoirs about in accessible summits and stored water to refresh the thirsty plains through hidden veins and surface streams?

No wonder man from the beginning of history has

turned to the heights for inspiration, for here is the spirit awed by the infinite and here one sees both the mystery of creation and the manifestations of the Father's loving kindness. Here man finds a witness, unimpeachable though silent, to the Omnipotence, the Omniscience and the Goodness of God. [*From letter on Eastern India.*]

DEFEAT

The friends of these reforms have fought a good fight; they have kept the faith, and they will not have finished their course until the reforms are accomplished. Let us be grateful for the progress made, and "with malice toward none and charity for all" begin the work of the next campaign. Those who fight for the right may be defeated, but they are never conquered. They may suffer reverses, but they never suffer disgrace. [*From a letter written November 8, 1894, after his defeat for U. S. Senator.*]

AMERICANISM

Like all travelers who have visited other lands, I return with delight to the land of my birth, more proud of its people, with more confidence in its government and grateful to the kind Providence that cast my lot in the United States. My national pride has

been increased because of the abundant evidence I have seen in the altruistic interest taken by Americans in the people of other countries. No other nation can show such a record of benevolence and disinterested friendship. My love for our form of government has been quickened as I have visited castles and towers, and peered into dark dungeons and I am glad that our nation, profiting by the experience of the past and yet unhampered by traditions and unfettered by caste, has been permitted to form a new center of civilization on new soil and erect here "a government of the people, by the people and for the people." I also return more deeply impressed than ever before with the responsibility that rests upon our nation as an exemplar among the nations and more solicitous that we, avoiding the causes which have led other nations to decay, may present a higher ideal than has ever before been embodied in a national life and carry human progress to a higher plane than it has before reached. [*From Madison Square Garden, New York, speech, Aug. 30, 1906.*]

WAR

War is harsh; it is attended by hardship and suffering; it means a vast expenditure of men and money. We may well pray for the coming of the day, promised in Holy Writ, when the swords shall be beaten into plowshares and the spears into pruning hooks; but universal peace cannot come until Justice is enthroned

throughout the world. Jehovah deals with nations as He deals with men, and for both decrees that the wages of sin is death. Until the right has triumphed in every land and love reigns in every heart government must, as a last resort, appeal to force. As long as the oppressor is deaf to the voice of reason, so long must the citizen accustom his shoulder to the musket and his hand to the saber. [*Extract from speech delivered at Trans-Mississippi Exposition, Omaha, Neb., June 14, 1898.*]

“A WORLD POWER”

I believe that if our nation would propose to make with every other nation a treaty providing that all questions in dispute between the parties should be submitted to The Hague court or some other impartial international tribunal for investigation and report before any declaration of war or commencement of hostilities, it would find many nations willing to enter into such a compact. I am sure from the public utterances of the present prime minister of Great Britain, Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman, that such a treaty could be made between the two great English-speaking nations and their example would be followed until the danger of war would be almost, if not entirely, removed. To take the lead in such a movement would establish our position as a world power in the best sense of the term. What argument can be advanced against such action on the part of the United States?

Shall we yield to any other nation in the estimate to be placed upon the value of human life? I confess that my aversion to killing increases with the years. Surely the Creator did not so plan the universe as to make the progress of the race dependent upon wholesale blood letting. I prefer to believe that war, instead of being an agency for good, is rather an evidence of man's surrender to his passions, and that one of the tests of civilization is man's willingness to submit his controversies to the arbitration of reason rather than of force. [*From Madison Square Garden, New York, speech, Aug. 30, 1906.*]

DUTY OF SUPERIOR NATIONS

The Christian nations must lead the movement for the promotion of peace, not only because they are enlisted under the banner of the Prince of Peace, but also because they have attained such a degree of intelligence that they can no longer take pride in a purely physical victory. The belief that moral questions can be settled by the shedding of human blood is a relic of barbarism; to doubt the dynamic power of righteousness is infidelity to truth itself. That nation which is unwilling to trust its cause to the universal conscience or which shrinks from the presentation of its claims before a tribunal where reason holds sway betrays a lack of faith in the soundness of its position. I venture to suggest that the world's peace would

be greatly promoted by an agreement among the leading nations that no declaration of war should be made until the submission of the question in controversy to an impartial court for investigation, each nation reserving the right to accept or reject the decision. The preliminary investigation would in almost every instance insure an amicable settlement and the reserved rights would be a sufficient protection against any possible injustice. [*From address entitled "The White Man's Burden," delivered before The American Society, London, July 4, 1906.*]

THE MYSTERIES OF NATURE

One of the virtues of Elisha Gray's (author of "Nature's Miracles") writings is that he presents scientific truth without materialistic coloring. His study of nature did not lead him to forget nature's God. The investigation of science ought to increase rather than diminish reverence for the Creator, for each new discovery proves more clearly the wisdom and power of the great Designer. The patterns that He has set invite limitless effort. The soap bubble presents a combination of colors that the artist has thus far failed to match; a pint of water holds a latent energy which no giant can boast; the trembling leaf contains a laboratory more complete than the chemist has been able to construct; the tiniest seed that falls to the ground possesses a potency that man has not yet fathomed.

Working in the midst of mysteries and dumb in the presence of the daily miracle of life we are constantly gathering evidence of the loving kindness of the Infinite Intelligence who has so bountifully provided for the supplying of every human need. [*Commoner editorial, 1905.*]

IMMORTALITY

I have here a little grain of wheat; it grew more than 3,000 years ago on the banks of the Nile. Ten centuries before the Babe of Bethlehem was carried down into Egypt to escape the wrath of Herod, the stalk upon which this little grain matured was swaying in the breezes that fanned the brow of the Sphinx. All these years it has slumbered in an ancient tomb. Had it been planted, and all its progeny after it, the lineal descendants of that one grain would be numerous enough to feed the teeming world today. In every grain of wheat there is a germ of life—a germ of life that has within it the power to discard the body of today and construct from air and earth not a new body alone, but many new bodies—and into each one of the many it can put the power to continue the work of reproduction. If the vital spark in a grain of wheat can pass unchanged through countless deaths and resurrections, surely the spirit of man will be able to defy the grave. All nature proclaims that there is another life, and the belief in that other life lends comfort to us when, separated from a friend, we have

the assurance that it is but for a time. The belief in immortality relieves the somber character of an occasion like this, for we are assured that the congenial spirits who meet and mingle here will hold communion in the world beyond. Belief in immortality not only gives consolation but it gives strength. We can better resist the temptation to do wrong to others when we expect to meet and associate with them in an endless world where our secret thoughts will be made known. [*From address delivered at Elk's Lodge of Sorrow, Lincoln, Neb., Dec. 2, 1906.*]

To every created thing God has given a tongue that proclaims a resurrection.

If the Father deigns to touch with divine power the cold and pulseless heart of the buried acorn and to make it burst forth into a new life, will He leave neglected in the earth the soul of man, made in the image of his creator? If He stoops to give to the rose bush whose withered blossoms float upon the autumn breeze, the sweet assurance of another springtime, will He refuse the words of hope to the sons of men when the frosts of winter come? If matter, mute and inanimate, though changed by the forces of nature into a multitude of forms, can never die, will the spirit of man suffer annihilation when it has paid a brief visit like a royal guest to this tenement of clay? No, I am as sure that there is another life as I am that I live today! I am sure that, as the grain of wheat contains within

an invisible germ which can discard its body and build a new one from earth and air, so this body contains a soul which can clothe itself anew when this poor frame crumbles into dust. [*From "The Prince of Peace," an address delivered on various occasions.*]

MOTHERHOOD

Fredericksburg is not a large city and yet it is rich in incidents of great historic value. Here the women of America have reared a monument to Mary the mother of Washington. I am glad to stand on this spot; I am glad to feel the influences which surround her grave. In a campaign, especially in a campaign like this, there is much of bitterness, and sometimes of abuse spoken against the candidates for public office, but, my friends, there is one character, the mother—a candidate for the affections of all mankind—against whom no true man ever uttered a word of abuse. There is one name, mother, which is never found upon the tongue of the slanderer—in her presence all criticism is silenced. The painter has, with his brush, transferred the landscape to the canvas with such fidelity that the trees and grasses seem almost real; he has even made the face of a maiden seem instinct with life, but there is one picture so beautiful that no painter has ever been able to perfectly reproduce it, and that is the picture of the mother holding in her arms her babe. Within the shadow of this monument,

reared to the memory of her who in her love and loyalty represents the mother of each one of us, I bow in humble reverence to motherhood. [*From speech delivered at Fredericksburg, Va., during campaign of 1896.*]

TARIFA

As the traveler leaves Gibraltar for the west he bids farewell to Africa and to Europe at the same time. Gibraltar and a somewhat similar rock on the opposite side of the channel, the two, anciently known as the Pillars of Hercules, stand out in bold relief against the sky. These rocks are not the last land, however, although the most striking features. There is a point a few miles farther west known as Tarifa which, according to tradition, was once occupied by bold robbers who exacted tribute from all who passed by. It is even said that our word tariff traces its origin to this Tarifa; if it be true that the two words are related it is fitting that Tarifa should be the last thing seen by the traveler on his departure, for the tariff is the first thing which he encounters upon his arrival in America. [*From letter on Spain.*]

TOLSTOY

Tolstoy's career shows how despotic is the sway of the heart and how, after all, it rules the world, for

while his literary achievements have been admired, the influence which they have exerted is as nothing as compared with the influence exerted by his philosophy. People enjoy reading his character sketches, his dialogues and his descriptions of Russian life, but these do not take hold upon men like his simple presentation of the doctrine of love, exemplified in his life as clearly as it is expressed by his pen. Many of his utterances are denied publication in Russia, and when printed abroad cannot be carried across the border; and yet he has made such a powerful impression upon the world that he is himself safe from molestation. He can say with impunity against his government and against the Greek church what it would be perilous for others to say, and this very security is proof positive that in Russia thought inspired by love is, as Carlyle has declared it to be everywhere, stronger than artillery parks. [*From letter on Tolstoy.*]

CORONATION OF A KING

I do not expect to witness another coronation, and it will be some satisfaction to remember that the first and only one attended was that of a king whom the people of their own accord selected; for if there is anything more democratic than a republican form of government, it is the fundamental principle that the people have a right to have whatever form of government they desire. Jefferson emphasized this doctrine

when the people of France called Napoleon to the throne, and it has Bible sanction as well, for when the children of Israel still demanded a king, even after Samuel explained what a king would do, he was told to let them have their way. [*From letter on Norway.*]

VALUABLE ASSETS

Although nations boast of material wealth and manufacturing plants, their most valuable assets are their men and women of merit, and their greatest factories are their institutions of learning, which convert priceless raw material into a finished product of inestimable worth. Gladstone, vigorous in body, strong in mind and elevated in moral purpose, was an ornament to the age in which he lived and will be an inspiration to succeeding generations. [*From letter on Great Britain.*]

AMERICAN PHILANTHROPY

I do not apologize for mentioning from time to time the institutions which altruistic Americans have scattered over the Orient. If we can not boast that the sun never sets on American territory, we can find satisfaction in the fact that the sun never sets on American philanthropy; if the boom of our cannon does not follow the Orb of Day in his daily round, the grateful

thanks of those who have been the beneficiaries of American generosity form a chorus that encircles the globe. [*From letter on India.*]

JERUSALEM

Once within the city, one is surrounded on every hand by places that stir the tenderest of memories. Even the uncertainty as to the identification of many of the sites made sacred by the life, the sufferings and the death of Christ—even the rivalry between the various sects cannot prevent feelings of reverence. Here He whose name is borne by increasing millions was condemned without cause, crowned with thorns and at last crucified, sealing with His blood the testimony of His life. [*From letter on Jerusalem.*]

BUSINESS HONOR

Professor Jenks, in calling attention to business honor as now defined, said in a recent speech: "The frequency of great fortunes, gathered perhaps legally but in ways felt to be unjust, through the power of monopoly, have tended strongly to obscure the moral vision of many well meaning men, who have been thereby led to confound morality with social righteousness; and their acts have formed the excuse for

many others to break the laws, which seem to them unjust. The profit from an unjust, though legal, stock watering may well prove more demoralizing in business circles than the illegal freight rebate which saves from ruin a grain shipper caught at a disadvantage."

A large volume could be written on this subject and many interesting instances could be given to illustrate modern business honor. Professor Jenks calls attention to the monopoly. Men who would blush to be called highwaymen will rob through monopoly and defend it, although their crime is grand larceny as compared with the petty stealings of the highwaymen. Men who break laws with impunity, when those laws stand in the way of their grasping methods, will pose as friends of law and order when some small crime is committed. We have recently seen a man prominent in the financial world escape from the charge of embezzlement on the ground that he had no personal interest in diverting insurance funds from the pockets of the policyholders to the treasury of the republican campaign committee, and now we see that same financier indicted, along with an ex-secretary of the treasury, for forgery, and their excuse is that they derived no pecuniary profit from their violation of the law. They simply did it to deceive the authorities of a foreign nation in which their company did business. Is it not time for our preachers, our publicists and our moralists to so define crime as to take away from these business men the excuse that they sin ignorantly? Is it not time that the

public conscience was turned upon these questions? The business men themselves ought to see to it that their class is relieved from the odium that attaches to these constant violations of statute and moral law. [*From an editorial in The Commoner.*]

THREE KINDS OF GOVERNMENT

I learned in the schools that there were three kinds of government: the monarchy, the aristocracy and the democracy. - The monarchy was supposed to be the strongest, the aristocracy the wisest, and the democracy the most just. If these definitions were correct, I would prefer the democracy, because justice is, after all, the only foundation upon which permanent government can rest. But I deny that monarchy is the strongest and that an aristocracy is the wisest. A government that can draw from the wisdom of all the people is wiser than a government that rests upon the wisdom of a part, for all the people know more than any of the people. Neither is a monarchy the strongest. It is said to act more quickly, but quickness is not the only characteristic of strength. I believe with Bancroft that a republic is, in truth, the strongest of all the governments because it builds its citadel in the hearts of men. I insist, therefore, our form of government is not only the most just, but the wisest and strongest, and I want it to be made stronger still by being made more just, if possible, than it is today.

Because I opposed imperialism some used to call me a little American, but I will allow no one to go beyond me in estimating this nation's greatness. No one goes beyond me in his conception of the nation's mission. Do you want this nation to dominate the inferior races? I want it to influence the great races as well. Do you want it to conquer half-civilized nations? I want it to be the leader of civilized nations. You can not go beyond me in your conception of this nation's future. I want this nation to shake every throne on earth! Not by force or violence, but by showing the world something better than thrones, a government resting upon the consent of the governed, strong because it is loved, and loved because it is good. [*From speech delivered at the Jamestown Exposition, May 30, 1907.*]

A HIGH PURPOSE

The ideal is of transcendent importance both to the individual and to those about him. Whether life is a success or not depends far more upon the moral purpose than it does upon the health or mental strength of the individual. History is replete with instances where men and women have accomplished much in spite of great physical infirmity. Helpless cripples and persons deformed have sometimes won a fame denied to athletes and to gladiators; sightless eyes have often beheld spiritual beauties which multitudes have failed to find; the bed of the invalid has sometimes been a

throne from which have flown blessings greater than a monarch can bestow. Not only has a high purpose overcome physical obstacles, but it has often made up for the lack of educational advantages. In innumerable cases an uneducated person, inspired by love for a great cause and filled with zeal, has surpassed those far better equipped, but lacking a compelling purpose. [*Address entitled "Man," delivered at Commencement Day exercises, Nebraska State University, June 15, 1905.*]

THE WISE AGE

A reader of *The Commoner* sends in the following:

"At ten years of age a boy thinks his father knows a great deal,

"At fifteen he knows as much as his father;

"At twenty he knows twice as much;

"At thirty he is willing to take his advice;

"At forty he begins to think his father knew something after all;

"At fifty he begins to seek his advice;

"And at sixty, after his father is dead, he thinks he was the smartest man that ever lived."

The above correctly states the stages through which one passes. At about eighteen or twenty the boy feels stronger than he ever does afterwards and thinks he knows more than he ever does know, but he learns after awhile to respect the wisdom of his father, especially when he becomes a father. There is an educa-

tion in all of the experiences of life. The parent educates the child and the child in turn enlarges the vision of the parent. Brothers and sisters exert an influence upon each other, and another part of our knowledge is gathered from rubbing up against the world.

If the child could only learn in youth that years have given valuable experience to the parent, the child might be saved much costly folly, but some children insist upon learning by experience, and they generally get the experience.

There is a common saying that the young man has to sow his wild oats. This is a complacent excuse given for youthful indiscretions, but it does not state the truth. It is not necessary that a boy should be bad in order to be good afterwards. It is from every standpoint better that his life shall be so regulated from the beginning that the memory is not stained by scars and blots. If the confidence which the boy has in his father at ten continued until he was twenty-five, he would not only escape the habits that carry so many to ruin but would be the stronger for life's work. [*From an editorial in The Commoner.*]

THE SCHOLAR IN GOVERNMENT

A great orator complained a generation ago that the scholar in the republic was not doing the work for which his education fitted him. He declared that the great truths relating to society were not the result of

scholarly meditation, but had been first heard in the solemn protest of martyred patriotism and the loud cries of crushed and starving labor—that the scholars, instead of making history, were content to write it “one-half truly and the other half as their prejudices blur and distort it.”

Let not this reproach be truthfully uttered against the scholars of America today. With a soil capable of supporting a vast population, with a climate that gives infinite variety and furnishes healing for every ill; with a people commingling the best blood of all the races and a government which furnishes the greatest stimulus to high endeavor—here the scholar ought to find the most powerful incentive and be inspired to the most heroic effort. Whether he turns his attention to the improvement of crops and herbs, to mechanical labor, to the perfecting of methods of exchange, or to the cheapening of transportation, or ministers as a physician to the ills of the body, or as an instructor to the wants of the mind, or as a religious teacher to the needs of the heart, no matter to what he devotes himself, infinite possibilities are before him. In whatever walk of life he takes his place he cannot shirk the duties of citizenship, for, living in a land where every citizen is a sovereign and where no one dares to wear a crown, he must help to make the government good or share the blame for permitting evils that might be corrected.

If we apply the term coward to one who, from fear of bodily harm, falters upon the battlefield, we must find some harsher term to apply to those who igno-

miniously withdraw themselves from the struggle of to-day, in the presence of the tremendous problems which require for their wise solution all the energies of the body, all the powers of the mind and all the virtues of the heart. [*Address entitled "Man," delivered at Commencement Day exercises, Nebraska State University, June 15, 1905.*]

WINNING BY JUSTICE

The president has authorized Secretary of State Root to notify the Chinese ambassador that he will recommend the reduction of the indemnity agreed upon at the close of the boxer trouble. The indemnity claimed by the United States was \$24,440,000 and some six millions have been paid. It has been found that \$11,000,000 will cover our loss and expense incurred, and the president will ask congress to reduce the amount to the actual loss incurred.

This is an act of justice which very naturally impresses the Chinese with our fairness and the Chinese ambassador has, in eloquent words, expressed his nation's gratitude. Our nation strengthens its position when it gives evidence of its desire to do justice to all in its international dealings and the president has made no mistake in reaching the conclusion which has been announced.

Some forty years ago our government voluntarily reduced an indemnity which Japan was paying and

the Japanese always speak of it in extending a welcome to an American. As nations collect indemnity by force it is the more important that they should scrupulously avoid anything like extortion. Our nation sets a splendid example in refusing to accept more than the damages actually suffered and time will demonstrate that from a commercial standpoint as well as from the standpoint of morals it pays for our government to be just. [*From an editorial in The Commoner.*]

GRAFT

In Arkansas a former state senator is serving a penitentiary sentence and doing work with the other convicts as a punishment for graft. However humiliating it may be to have a state official in the chain gang it speaks well for democratic Arkansas that she administers punishment to the guilty without regard to position in society or politics. Leniency is more often shown to those standing high in public esteem than to those who are obscure, but as a rule the lowly are more deserving of sympathy. Those who are prominent have usually had greater advantages and are hedged about with influences which strengthen and support. Those, on the other hand, who are reared in the slums or who live upon the ragged edge of society and have a struggle for existence—these are less fortified against temptation. If those sin most who sin against the light then those deserve the severest pun-

ishment who add to their crimes the betrayal of public confidence. Investigations show that graft is widespread. Legislators sell their votes, county commissioners traffic in contracts, city councils barter away valuable franchises and school trustees collect commissions on supplies—not all of course, but enough violate their oath of office to call for vigorous enforcement of the criminal law and the cultivation of a public opinion which will compel honesty in public servants. Arkansas is doing her part in the enforcement of the law and her example ought to be followed; the ministers and editors should do their part in cultivating public opinion. [*From an editorial in The Commoner.*]

THANKSGIVING

On the Fourth of July the eagle seems a little larger than it does on any other day, and its scream may grate more harshly on the foreign ear than it does at any other time. But on this day we cultivate reverence and express our appreciation of those blessings that have come to our country without the thought or aid of Americans. We have reason to look with some degree of pride upon the achievement of the United States; we contemplate the present with satisfaction, and look to the future with hope; and yet on this occasion we may well remember that we are but building upon the foundations that have been laid for us. We did not create the fertile soil that is the basis of our

agricultural greatness; the streams that drain and feed our valleys were not channelled by human hands. We did not fashion the climate that gives us the white cotton belt of the south, the yellow wheat belt of the north, and the central corn belt that joins the two and overlaps them both. We do not gather up the moisture and fix the date of the early and later rains; we did not hide away in the mountains the gold and the silver; we did not store in the earth the deposits of copper and of zinc; we did not create the measures of coal and the beds of iron. All these natural resources, which we have but commenced to develop, are the gift of Him before Whom we bow in gratitude tonight. [*From speech delivered at banquet given to Ambassador Choate, Thanksgiving Day, London, November 26, 1903.*]

“LOYALTY TO THE MONEY BAG”

Greed for gain has raged like a fever, but there are signs of abatement. The standard of measurement has too often been wealth—no matter how secured—but there is evidence of a return to higher ideals. Many have been “hoodwinked into believing” that what Carlyle calls “loyalty to the money-bag” is a noble loyalty, but he speaks the verdict of history when he says:

“Mammon, cries the generous heart out of all ages and countries, is the basest of known gods, even of known devils. In him what glory is there, that ye should worship him? No glory discernible; not even

terror; at best detestability, ill-matched with despicability!"

And in the days to come—may they draw near!—we shall learn anew that "thought is stronger than artillery parks," and that "the beginning of all thought worthy of the name is Love." [*From an article written for "Public Opinion" in May, 1905.*]

FREE SPEECH

Since I have been here I have been profoundly impressed with the part that Englishmen have taken in establishing the right of free speech. And I may say that before I came to this country the thing that most challenged my admiration in the Englishman was his determination to make his opinion known when he had an opinion that he thought should be given to the world. Passing through the Bank of England, to which my friend, the ambassador, has referred, my attention was called to a protest that Admiral Cochrane wrote upon the bank-note with which he paid the thousand pounds fine that had been assessed against him. I was interested in that protest because it showed a fearlessness that indicates the possibilities of the race. Let me read what he said: "My health having suffered by long and close confinement, and my oppressors having resolved to deprive me of property or life, I submit to robbery to protect myself from murder (laughter) in the hope that I shall live to bring the delin-

quents to justice." (Renewed laughter.) That is the spirit that moves the world! There was a man in prison. He must pay his fine in order to gain his liberty. He believed the action of the court unjust. He knew that if he stayed there he would lose his life and lose the chance for vindication, and yet, as he was going forth from the prison doors, he did not go with bowed head or cringing, but flung his protest in the face of his oppressors, and told them he submitted to robbery to protect his life in the hope that, having escaped from their hands, he might bring them to justice. I like that in the Englishman, and during my short knowledge of public affairs I have looked across the ocean and admired the moral courage and the manliness of those Englishmen who have dared to stand out against overwhelming odds and assert their opinions before the world. [*From speech delivered at banquet given to Ambassador Choate, London, November 26, 1903.*]

PLUTOCRACY

Plutocracy is abhorrent to a republic; it is more despotic than monarchy, more heartless than aristocracy, more selfish than bureaucracy. It preys upon the nation in time of peace and conspires against it in the hour of its calamity. Conscienceless, compassionless and devoid of wisdom, it enervates its votaries while it impoverishes its victims. It is already sapping the strength of the nation, vulgarizing social life and making mock-

ery out of morals. The time is ripe for the overthrow of this giant wrong. In the name of the counting rooms, which it has defiled; in the name of business honor which it has polluted; in the name of the home which it has despoiled; in the name of religion which it has disgraced; in the name of the people whom it has oppressed, let us make our appeal to the awakened conscience of the nation. [*From Madison Square Garden, New York, speech, August 30, 1906.*]

REVENGE

The papers announce that an eastern spinster has left her former lover a fortune estimated at \$150,000, on condition that he obtain a divorce from his wife. The spinster was disappointed because he finally preferred another woman to her and takes her revenge by trying to separate them. At first it might seem that the revenge was aimed at her successful rival, but the man is really the one at whom the thrust is made, for if he were sordid enough to divorce his wife to secure a fortune he would soon become an object of pity, for the contempt of his neighbors would make life unbearable. But what shall we say of the revengeful spirit which affixed the condition to the bequest. Possibly she thought she loved the man, but true love shows itself in a different way.

If she had loved him as many have loved she would either have kept silent, or, if she wanted to leave him

money, she would have left it for him to use to promote his own happiness and welfare. Her love was of the kind that leads young men to kill their sweethearts (when they have been rejected) and then kill themselves.

It is a selfish love—if love can be selfish—that prompts one to punish the object of his affection. Sacrifice is the language of love. “Greater love hath no man than this that he lay down his life for his friend”—but the so-called love which exacts a penalty has in it the element of revenge rather than genuine affection.

And revenge is the hardest load that any one can carry. No one is strong enough to attempt such a burden, and no one can afford to risk its corroding influence on his life. This conditional bequest shows how cherishing revenge will warp a nature. [*Editorial in The Commoner.*]

THE GREATER MAN AND NATION

I visited the Tower of London today and saw upon the wall a strange figure. It was made of swords, ramrods, and bayonets, and was fashioned into the form of a flower. Someone had put a card on it and aptly named it the passion flower—and it has been too often the international flower. But the world has made progress. No longer do ambition and avarice furnish a sufficient excuse for war. The world has made progress, and today you cannot justify bloodshed except in defense of a right already ascertained, and

then only when all peaceable means have been exhausted. The world has made progress. We have reached a point where we respect not the man who will die to secure some pecuniary advantage, but who will die in defense of his rights. We admire the moral courage of the man who is willing to die in defense of his rights, but there is yet before us a higher ground. Is he great who will die in defense of his rights? There is yet to come a greater man still—the man who will die rather than trespass upon the rights of another. Hail to the nation whatever its name may be that leads the world towards the realization of this higher ideal. I am glad that we now recognize that there is something more powerful than physical force, and no one has stated it better than Carlyle. He said that thought was stronger than artillery parks, and at last moulded the world like soft clay; that behind thought was love, and that there never was a wise head that had not behind it a generous heart. The world is coming to understand that armies and navies, however numerous and strong, are impotent to stop thought. Thought inspired by love will yet rule the world. I am glad that there is a national product more valuable than gold or silver, more valuable than cotton and wheat or corn or iron, the ideal. That is a merchandise—if I may call it such—that moves freely from country to country. You cannot vex it with an export tax or hinder it with an import tariff. It is greater than legislators, and rises triumphant over the machinery of government. In the rivalry to present the best ideal to the world, love, not hatred, will control; and I am glad

that on this Thanksgiving Day I can meet with my countrymen and their friends here assembled, return thanks for what my country has received, thanks for the progress that the world has made, and contemplate with joy the coming of that day when the rivalry between nations will be, not to see which can injure the other most, but to show which can hold highest the light that guides the pathway of the human race to higher ground. [*From speech delivered at banquet given to Ambassador Choate, London, November 26, 1903.*]

PAYING WHAT WE OWE

We sometimes feel that we have a sort of proprietary interest in the principles of government set forth in the Declaration of Independence. That is a document which we have given to the world, and yet the principles set forth therein were not invented by an American. Thomas Jefferson expressed them in felicitous language and put them into permanent form, but the principles had been known before. The doctrine that all men are created equal, that they are endowed with inalienable rights, that governments were instituted amongst men to secure these rights, and that they derived their just power from the consent of the governed—this doctrine which stands four square with all the world was not conceived in the United States, it did not spring from the American mind—aye, it did not come so much from any mind as it was an emana-

tion from the heart, and it had been in the hearts of men for ages. Before Columbus turned the prow of his ship towards the west on that eventful voyage, before the Barons wrested Magna Charta from King John—yes, before the Roman legions landed on the shores of this island—aye, before Homer sang—that sentiment had nestled in the heart of man, and nerved him to resist the oppressor. That sentiment was not even of human origin. Our own great Lincoln declared that it was God himself who implanted in every human heart the love of liberty. Yes, when God created man, when He gave him life, He linked to life the love of liberty, and what God hath joined together let no man put asunder. We have received great blessings from God and from all the world, and what is our duty? We cannot make return to those from whom those gifts were received. It is not in our power to make return to the Father above. Nor can we make return to those who have sacrificed so much for our advancement. The child can never make full return to the mother whose life trembled in the balance at its birth, and whose kindness and care guarded it in all the years of infancy. The student cannot make full return to the teacher who awakened the mind, and aroused an ambition for a broader intellectual life. The adult cannot make full return to the patriarch whose noble life gave inspiration and incentive. So a generation cannot make return to the generation gone; it must make its return to the generations to come. Our nation must discharge its debt not to the dead, but to the living. How can our country dis-

charge this great debt? In but one way, and that is by giving to the world something equal in value to that which it has received from the world. And what is the greatest gift that man can bestow upon man? Feed a man and he will hunger again; give him clothing and his clothing will wear out; but give him a noble ideal, and that ideal will be with him through every waking hour, lifting him to a higher plane of life, and giving him a broader conception of his relations to his fellows. [*From speech delivered at banquet given to Ambassador Choate, London, November 26, 1903.*]

THE TWENTY-THIRD PSALM

One thought often comes to the mind as the different scenes are visited, viz., that a visit to the Holy Land makes it easier to understand many Bible passages and gives added significance to others. We have seen the barren fig tree and the fruitful vine; we have seen the lame and the blind, and have met the leper at the gate; we have seen the tiny lamp, such as the wise and foolish virgins carried—lamps that need often to be refilled; and we have seen the “whited sepulchres,” “full of dead men’s bones.” We have been impressed with the life-giving power of a fountain in a barren land and can more fully realize the force of the promise that the man who delighteth “in the law of the Lord” shall be like “a tree planted by the rivers of water.”

But no part of the Old Testament has been brought more vividly to our minds than the Twenty-third Psalm. Life is much the same here today as it was two, three, four thousand years ago, and we have seen innumerable flocks and have watched the sheep following the shepherd with confidence as he, staff in hand, led them into new pastures or from hillside to stream. No animal is more helpless than the sheep and no guardian more tender than the shepherd. The sheep know their master's voice, and we have several times seen a shepherd carrying a lamb in his arms. The hills about Jerusalem, the springs, the shepherds and their flocks, will rise before us whenever we read again:

“The Lord is my shepherd; I shall not want. He maketh me to lie down in green pastures; He leadeth me beside the still waters.” [*From letter on Jerusalem.*]

THE MOUNT OF BEATITUDES

There is nothing to determine just where the Sermon on the Mount was delivered, but because the Horns of Hattin have been associated with that wonderful discourse, I was anxious to visit the place. There is no road leading to this eminence and the bridle paths can scarcely be followed. The ground is covered by boulders and broken stones, half concealed by grass and thistles and flowers. The guide stepped over a large snake before we had gone far, and as it was

of a very poisonous variety, he felt that he had had a narrow escape. From a distance the top of the hill is saddle-shaped, and the two horns have given it its name, but on the top there is a large circular basin probably two hundred yards in diameter, and the rim of this basin was once walled and a citadel built there.

The view from this mount is one of the most beautiful I have ever seen. To the north, Hermon rises in grandeur, his summit covered with snow; the intervening space is filled with hills except in the immediate foreground where the sea of Galilee sparkles in the sun. At the foot of the mount stretches a verdant valley, and from the valley a defile runs down to the sea. This opening gives a view of the shore where Capernaum and Bethsaida are supposed to have stood, and one of the roads from the sea to Nazareth follows the stream which flows through this defile. On the opposite side of the Mount, Tabor can be seen, and beyond, the hills of Samaria. There is inspiration in this commingling of hill and vale and sea and sky.

Whether, as a matter of fact, Christ, "seeing the multitude," ascended to this place I know not, but it furnishes an environment fit for the sublime code of morality presented in the Sermon on the Mount. No other philosophy has ever touched so high a point or presented so noble a conception of human life. In its purity of heart is made the test, mercy is enjoined, humility emphasized, forgiveness commanded and love made the law of action. In that Sermon He pointed out the beginnings of evil, rebuked those who allow

themselves to be engrossed by the care of the body and gave to the world a brief, simple and incomparable prayer which the Christian world repeats in unison.

If in other places He relieved those whose sufferings came through the infirmities of the flesh, He here offered a balm for the healing of the nations. [*From letter on Galilee.*]

IMITATION

Both individuals and nations borrow; imitation, not originality, is the rule. It will humble the pride of anyone to attempt to separate that which he has learned from others from that which he can claim as his own by right of discovery.

Steam is the same today that it was ages ago, and yet millions watched it escaping from the kettle with no thought of its latent power. One man showed mankind the use to which it could be put and all the rest profited by the idea. Shall we refuse to ride upon the railroad or cross the waters in an ocean greyhound for fear of employing the conception of another? Electricity is not a new agency. The lightnings have illumined the sky from the dawn of creation, and the people saw in them only cause for fear. A few decades ago one man thought out a method by which it could be imprisoned in a wire, and now widely separated lands are united by telegraph lines, while cables traverse the ocean's bed. Shall we refuse to read the news that the current carries or reject a message from

home because we must employ an idea which sprang from another's brain? He is stupid who rejects truth, no matter from what source it comes; that nation is blind which does not welcome light from anywhere and everywhere. It is to the glory, not to the shame, of the land of the Rising Sun that her people have been quick to obey the injunction, "Prove all things; hold fast that which is good." [*From letter on Japan.*]

CONFUCIANISM

China has followed an ideal and followed it with a diligence rarely exhibited, but that ideal has been weighed in the balance and found wanting. It is often said in defense of Confucianism that its founder gave to his disciples the golden rule, stated in its negative form, but too little emphasis has been given to the difference between the doctrine of Confucius, "Do not unto others as you would not have others do unto you," and, the doctrine of the Nazarene, "Whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them." There is a world of difference between negative harmlessness and positive helpfulness, and Christianity could well afford to rest its case against Confucianism on the comparison of these two doctrines.

In the Analects of Confucius the philosopher is asked, "Is there one word which may serve as a rule of practice for all one's life?" He was answered, "Is not reciprocity such a word?" Here we have the doctrine

of selfishness as plausibly presented as it will ever be again. Life is described as a balancing of favors—a nice calculation of good done and good received. There is no suggestion here of a heart overflowing with love, no intimation of a blessedness to be found in giving.

At another time someone asked Confucius, "What do you say concerning the principle that injury should be recompensed with kindness?" He replied, "With what, then, will you recompense kindness? Recompense injury with justice and recompense kindness with kindness." In reply to another question, he goes so far as to charge that one "who returns good for evil is a man that is careful of his person." How different these precepts are from those of the Sermon on the Mount! Christians are accused of failure to live up to the high ideal presented by Jesus, and the accusation is just and yet, although the Christian nations fall far short of the measure which they themselves recognize, although professing Christians reflect but imperfectly the rays which fall upon them from the Sun of Righteousness, they are leading the world in all that is ennobling and uplifting, and China gives silent recognition to the superiority of the western ideal in every reform which she undertakes. [*From letter on China.*]

"SERMONS IN STONES"

There are "sermons in stones" and the stones of this canyon preach many impressive ones. They not only

testify to the omnipotence of the Creator but they record the story of a stream which both moulds, and is moulded by, its environment. It can not escape from the walls of its prison and yet it has made its impress upon the granite as, in obedience to the law of gravitation, it has gone dashing and foaming on its path to the sea.

How like a human life! Man, flung into existence without his volition, bearing the race-mark of his parents, carrying the impress of their lives to the day of his death, hedged about by an environment that shapes and moulds him before he is old enough to plan or choose, how these constrain and hem him in! And yet, he too, leaves his mark upon all that he touches as he travels, in obedience to his sense of duty, the path that leads from the cradle to the grave. But here the likeness ends. The Colorado, pure and clear in the mountains, becomes a dark and muddy flood before it reaches the ocean, so contaminated is it by the soil through which it passes; but man, if controlled by a noble purpose and inspired by high ideals, may purify, rather than be polluted by his surroundings, and by resistance to temptation make the latter end of his life more beautiful even than the beginning.

The river also teaches a sublime lesson of patience. It has taken ages for it to do its work and in that work every drop of water has played its part. It takes time for individuals or groups of individuals to accomplish a great work and because time is required those who labor in behalf of their fellows sometimes become discouraged. Nature teaches us to labor and to wait.

Viewed from day to day the progress of the race is imperceptible; viewed from year to year, it can scarcely be noted, but viewed by decades or centuries the upward trend is apparent, and every good work and word and thought contributes toward the final result. As nothing is lost in the economy of nature, so nothing is lost in the social and moral world. As the stream is composed of an innumerable number of rivulets, each making its little offering and each necessary to make up the whole, so the innumerable number of men and women who recognize their duty to society and their obligations to their fellows are contributing according to their strength to the sum total of the forces that make for righteousness and progress. [*Newspaper article on "Wonders of the West," referring particularly to the Grand Canyon of the Colorado, in northern Arizona.*]

TWO SYSTEMS

Japan needs the Christian religion; a nation must have some religion and she has outgrown Buddhism. The ideals presented by these two systems are in many respects diametrically opposed to each other. One looks forward, the other backward; one regards life as a blessing to be enjoyed and an opportunity to be improved, the other sees in it only evil from which escape should be sought; one crowns this life with immortality, the other adds to a gloomy existence the darker night of annihilation; one offers faith as the

inspiration to noble deeds, the other presents a plan for the perfecting of self with no sense of responsibility to God to prompt it or promise of reward to encourage it; one enlarges the sympathies and links each individual with all other human beings, the other turns thought inward in search of perpetual calm. [*From letter on Japan.*]

DEATH

This endless procession has been moving on towards one goal, from the time when man was placed upon this footstool to carry out a divine decree; and there is no turning back from this way. No one is rich enough to purchase immunity, and no one so poor as to escape notice. No one is strong enough to resist the grim reaper, and no one so weak as to excite his pity.

There is a time when death might seem a natural visitor; in extreme old age. When the joints become stiff and the flesh wastes away; when the eyes grow dim and the ears no longer drink in the music of the voice. Then it might seem that death were an appropriate thing. But how few reach advanced age. A large percentage of the human race—a larger per cent than need be—die young. The summons comes to the very babe before its infinite possibilities begin to unfold; the summons comes when it has no coin with which to make payment for the care it secures, except the smile, and the smile remains when the face

is gone. Sometimes the summons comes to the student just completing an education, prepared with trained mind and lofty purposes to take up the work of life—but the diploma is no answer to the summons. Again it comes to the mother; the child on her breast pleads for her, and the child at her knee clenches his chubby fist in defiance, but in vain; they must grow up without the knowledge of a mother's love. And now it is the man in the full strength of life, bearing a double burden and dividing his attention between the home and the state; he staggers and falls, and those who convey his remains to the cemetery try to comfort those whom he has left, and endeavor to divide among them the public task which he has left unfinished. Sometimes the cup comes to the lips of one whose whitened locks record the passing of many winters; his ripe experience has made him a treasure house from which wisdom can be drawn, and his spiritual wealth is a benediction to the home, and makes him a tower of strength to the church, but the chair by the fireside is vacated. Why is it that there must be this rude sundering of the ties that bind us to earth, and to each other? Why? A myriad of times this question has risen from broken hearts, and still no answer. I shall not attempt to answer it. But I can say in the language of the poet:

I do not see
Why God should e'en permit some things to be,
When He is love;
But I can see,
Though, often dimly, through the mystery,
His hand above!

And that hand has inscribed some lessons upon the tomb so clear and plain that all may read them.

Death, by its very uncertainty, teaches us to use the present hour. If we were assured of three score years and ten we might yield to the temptation to postpone everything to the later years. But the fact that we know not the day nor the hour when the call may come to us forces us to use today lest tomorrow may not arrive.

And, then, death reminds us of our weakness. Man was made in the image of his Creator, and given dominion over the earth, the air and sea—made but a little lower than the angels, and behold the work of man's hand! He has harnessed the forces of nature and compelled them to do his bidding. He has converted the waterfalls into motive power; he has condensed the steam and commanded it to draw the commerce of a nation over the iron highways; his ships plough all the oceans, and they follow their charts unerringly no matter how dark the night. He has imprisoned the lightning in a tiny wire and sent it around the globe as his messenger, and he has even flung his words through space and imprinted them on instruments hundreds of miles away. No wonder man is boastful, and yet just as he imagines himself almost omnipotent, just as he reaches out to seize the crown, death touches him, or one he loves, and then he realizes how helpless he is.

Death turns our thoughts toward immortality. Heaven never seems so real to us as when it becomes the abode of someone whom we have known and loved.

When our treasures are there we can easily believe that no heart warmed to a glow by the fire of brotherly love will suffer an eternal chill, that no spiritual flame, that grows brighter with the years, will be extinguished never to shine again. [*From address delivered at Elk's Lodge of Sorrow, Lincoln, Neb., December 2, 1906.*]

THE IDEAL REPUBLIC

I can conceive of a national destiny surpassing the glories of the present and the past—a destiny which meets the responsibilities of today and measures up the possibilities of the future.

Behold a republic, resting securely upon the foundation stones quarried by revolutionary patriots from the mountain of eternal truth—a republic applying in practice and proclaiming to the world the self-evident proposition that all men are created equal; that they are endowed with inalienable rights; that governments are instituted among men to secure these rights; that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed.

Behold a republic in which civil and religious liberty stimulate all to earnest endeavor, and in which the law restrains every hand uplifted for a neighbor's injury—a republic in which every citizen is sovereign, but in which no one cares to wear a crown.

Behold a republic standing erect, while empires all around are bowed beneath the weight of their own

armaments—a republic whose flag is loved, while other flags are only feared.

Behold a republic increasing in population, in wealth, in strength and in influence, solving the problems of civilization and hastening the coming of a universal brotherhood—a republic which shakes thrones and dissolves aristocracies by its silent example, and gives light and inspiration to those who sit in darkness.

Behold a republic gradually but surely becoming the supreme moral factor in the world's progress and the accepted arbiter of the world's disputes—a republic whose history, like the path of the just, "is as the shining light that shineth more and more unto the perfect day." [*Indianapolis speech in 1900.*]

THE FLAG

The flag is a national emblem and is obedient to the national will. It was made for the people, not the people for the flag. When the American people want the flag raised, they raise it; when they want it hauled down, they haul it down. The flag was raised upon Canadian soil during the war of 1812 and it was hauled down when peace was restored. The flag was planted upon Chapultepec during the war with Mexico and it was hauled down when the war was over. The morning papers announce that General Lee ordered the flag hauled down in Cuba yesterday, because it was

raised too soon. The flag will be raised in Cuba again on the 1st of January, but the President declares in his message that it will be hauled down as soon as a stable government is established. Who will deny to our people the right to haul the flag down in the Philippines, if they so desire, when a stable government is established there?

Our flag stands for an indissoluble union of indestructible states. Every state is represented by a star and every territory sees in the constitution a star of hope that will some day take its place in the constellation. What is there in the flag to awaken the zeal or reflect the aspirations of vassal colonies which are too good to be cast away, but not good enough to be admitted to the sisterhood of states?

Shall we keep the Philippines and amend our flag? Shall we add a new star—the blood-star, Mars—to indicate that we have entered upon a career of conquest? Or shall we borrow the yellow and paint Saturn and his rings, to suggest a carpet-bag government, with its schemes of spoliation? Or shall we adorn our flag with a milky way composed of a multitude of minor stars representing remote and insignificant dependencies?

No, a thousand times better that we haul down the stars and stripes and substitute the flag of an independent republic than surrender the doctrines that give glory to "Old Glory." It was the flag of our fathers in the years that are gone; it is the flag of our nation in the years that are to come. Its stripes of red tell of the blood that was shed to purchase liberty;

its stripes of white proclaim the pure and heaven-born purpose of a government which derives its just powers from the consent of the governed. The mission of that flag is to float—not over a conglomeration of commonwealths and colonies—but over “the land of the free and the home of the brave;” and to that mission it must remain forever true—forever true. [*Extract from speech delivered at Lincoln, Neb., December 23, 1898.*]

DESTINY

Whenever a statesman is unable to defend a thing which he wants to have done, he usually hides behind the plea that it is destiny. That the readers of *The Commoner* may be able to answer this destiny argument the following quotation is given from the “*Last of the Barons*” by Bulwer. William of Hastings is described as laying his sins at the door of destiny, and the author makes this comment: “It is destiny!—phrase of the weak human heart! It is destiny! Dark apology for every error! The strong and virtuous admit no destiny! On earth guides conscience—in heaven, watches God. And destiny is but the phantom we invoke to silence the one, to dethrone the other!”

Each man’s destiny is in his own hands so far as his moral progress is concerned. If a man is going to be a thief, circumstances may determine whether it is his destiny to escape punishment or to be caught, but the man decides for himself the all-important question

whether he will be a thief. And so circumstances may determine how much profit or how little profit a country can find in a policy of imperialism, but the country itself must decide—the people or those whom the people permit to speak for them—what the policy of the country will be. Destiny is indeed the dark apology for many national errors. [*From an editorial in The Commoner.*]

EDUCATION

A cablegram from Manila says: "The first bill was passed by the Philippine assembly today. It appropriates one million dollars for the construction of schools throughout the provinces. The bill was passed unanimously. Isauro Gabaldon, a national member, who was the author of the first law, proposed several other measures at the same time that he introduced the school bill into the assembly. His measures included bills to construct a capital building, and to cancel the indebtedness of provinces and municipalities to the insular government. It was unanimously decided to inaugurate legislation with the school bill."

It is a good sign that Philippine legislation began with an educational bill, and what is better this significant course was adopted unanimously.

By wise action the Philippine assembly can strengthen the sentiment in favor of independence and give complete answer to the imperialists who say that the Filipinos are only half-civilized and incapable of

self-government. [*From an editorial in The Commoner.*]

An education is incomplete which does not place a noble purpose behind mental training and make the hands willing to work. The work should ultimately be the largest work of which the hands are capable, but at all times it should be the work that most needs to be done. That education is also defective which so inflames one's vanity or so shrivels one's heart as to separate him in sympathy from his fellows. Education has been known to do this—yes, education has even been known to make a graduate ashamed of his parents. A Chicago paper recently reported such a case. A mother who had been denied the advantages of the schools, but who had by economy and sacrifice enabled her son to attend college, visited him after he had established himself in the practice of the law. She had looked forward for years to his success, and started upon her visit with great expectations. She soon learned, however, that her presence embarrassed her son—that he did not want his clients to know that she was his mother. Her heart was broken, and as she waited at the depot alone for the train that would bear her back to her humble home, she poured forth her sorrow in a letter. If I thought that any of those who receive their diplomas on this glad day would allow their superior advantages to lessen their affection for their parents or to decrease their devotion to them, I would wish them children again. Better loving companionship than intellectual solitude, but there is no

reason why the scholar should be less a son or daughter. Head and heart should be developed together, and then each forward step will bring increasing joy, strengthen family ties and make early friendship more sacred.

If he is culpable who shrinks from full participation in the work of this struggling world, or shirks the responsibilities which he is by education prepared to assume, still more culpable are those who, by employing their talents against society, prey upon those who supplied their training. If by force or fraud or cunning one seeks to appropriate to his own use that which he has not earned, he turns against the public the weapons put into his hand by the public for the promotion of the common weal. [*Address entitled "Man," delivered at Commencement Day exercises, Nebraska State University, June 15, 1905.*]

THE SPRING AS AN ILLUSTRATION

Those who attempt to construct the world without reference to the spiritual forces which are at work defend altruism on the ground that it is an enlightened self-interest; they contend that the doing of good to others, even sacrificing for others, yields a reward in pleasure. The difficulty about the philosophy that rests upon such calculations is, first, that it is impossible for one to look far enough ahead to form any accurate opinion as to the time or manner in which the reward

is to come, and second, that time spent in calculation can better be spent in acting. The person who attempts to keep a book account of the good he does, does not, as a rule, do enough good to justify an entry in the book; the spirit that leads him to keep the account continually hampers him in his work. Life is made up of an innumerable number of small acts, not considered worth doing by those who are guided by selfish considerations. Of the countless millions of kind and generous acts done, but few would have been done had it been necessary to reason out just in what way the bread "cast upon the waters" would return.

The spring is the best illustration of a life conforming to the Christian ideal. As the spring pours forth constantly of that which refreshes and invigorates, seeking nothing in return, and asking not who is to be the recipient of its bounty, so a life consecrated to a noble purpose pours forth a constant flood of helpfulness; and man is as little able to follow through succeeding generations the good that he does as the spring is to trace the refreshing influence of its waters. [*Address entitled "Man," delivered at Commencement Day exercises, Nebraska State University, June 15, 1905.*]

FORCE

Is it the desire of any simply to make our flag feared? Let us rather make it loved by every human

being. Instead of having people bow before it, let us have them turn their faces toward it and thank God that there is one flag that stands for human rights and for the doctrine of self-government everywhere. There are some who say that we must now have the largest navy in the world in order to terrorize other nations, and make them respect us. But if we make our navy the largest in the world, other nations will increase their navies because we have increased ours, and then we will have to increase ours again because they will have increased theirs, and they will have to increase theirs again because we have increased ours—and there is no limit to this rivalry but the limit of the power of the people to bear the burdens of taxation.

There is a better, a safer and a less expensive plan. Instead of trying to make our navy the largest in the world, let us try to make our government the best government on earth. Instead of trying to make our flag float everywhere, let us make it stand for justice wherever it floats—for justice between man and man, for justice between nation and nation, and for humanity always. And then the people of the world will learn to know and to revere that flag, because it will be their protection as well as ours. And then if any king raises his hand against our flag, the oppressed people of his own land will rise up and say to him "Hands off! That flag stands for our rights as well as the rights of the American people." It is possible to make our flag represent such an ideal. We shall not fulfill our great mission, we shall not live up to our high duty, unless we present to the world the

highest ideals in individual life, in domestic life, in business life, in professional life, in political life—and the highest national ideal that the world has ever known. [*From lecture entitled "Value of An Ideal."*]

MARKHAM'S TRIBUTE TO LINCOLN

Markham to a remarkable degree possesses the poetic faculty of embalming a beautiful sentiment in beautiful language, so that his words linger in the memory. His tribute to Lincoln, like Gray's *Elegy*, idealizes the homely and familiar things that are a part of the existence of all. He ennobles Lincoln by making him one of the common people and by exalting the real elements of his greatness.

Where can we find such a collection of beautiful and appropriate similes?

The rectitude and patience of the rocks;
The gladness of the wind that shakes the corn;
The courage of the bird that dares the sea;
The justice of the rain that loves all leaves;
The pity of the snow that hides all scars;
The loving kindness of the wayside well;
The tolerance and equity of light.

Here are seven lines, each setting forth a virtue that would immortalize a man, and all, like the parables, are suggested by the every-day things of life.

It is a rare gift to be able to see the things around us, a rarer gift to be able to utilize them in speech or prose, and a still rarer gift to be able to clothe them in the resplendent language of poesy. Markham has an equipment of head and heart that fits him to portray a character that could combine rectitude, patience, gladness, courage, equity, tolerance, pity and loving kindness. [*From an editorial in The Commoner.*]

AMERICAN MONEY ABROAD

Our forefathers decided that titles were dangerous to liberty, and it is to be regretted that the patriotism of Revolutionary days has given place to a disgraceful scramble, among the daughters of some of our multi-millionaires, for lords and dukes and counts.

When an Englishman or Frenchman or other foreigner, with nothing to commend him but a title inherited from a remote ancestor (and possibly retained only because it could not be pawned), reaches majority, he embarks for the United States and enters into negotiations for some marriageable heiress or heiress-apparent. Instead of teaching their daughters to regard with favor the suits of worthy sons of this country, too many ambitious parents lead their daughters into the market-place, and seek to barter a fortune for a crown.

Love may leap across the ocean and join in holy wedlock "two hearts that beat as one," but social am-

bition and hereditary avarice can never weld two hearts into home-building material.

When Cupid becomes a boodler, and courtship is carried on by brokers, marriage is a mockery.

It is significant that poor American girls, however accomplished, have no charms for impecunious noblemen. It is also a source of congratulation that American sons do not seek foreign alliances. It is a shame that some American daughters do. [*From editorial in Omaha World-Herald, Nov. 3, 1895.*]

MIRACLES

Miracle of miracles is man! Most helpless of all God's creatures in infancy; most powerful when fully developed, and interesting always. Led in youth by the parent's hand, he becomes during maturity the staff of those who led him, and in age he is again helpless and must look for assistance to his children and his children's children. He is ever both instructor and pupil, teaching while he is being taught, daily exerting an influence while he receives impressions from his environment and carrying through life a power to help and harm, little less than infinite.

What incalculable space between a statue, however flawless the marble, however faultless the workmanship, and a human being "afame with the passion of eternity!" If the statue cannot, like a human being, bring the gray hairs of a parent "in sorrow to the

grave," or devastate a nation, or with murderous hand extinguish the vital spark in a fellow-being, neither can it, like a human being, minister to suffering mankind, nor scatter gladness "o'er a smiling land" nor yet claim the blessing promised in the Sermon on the Mount. Only to man, made in the divine likeness, is given the awful power to choose between measureless success and immeasurable woe. [*From address entitled "Man," delivered at Commencement Day exercises, Nebraska State University, June 15, 1905.*]

A LIVING FOUNTAIN

Jeremiah gave to literature a beautiful and striking figure when, in charging the children of Israel with apostasy, he said:

"They have forsaken me, the fountain of living waters, and hewed them out cisterns, broken cisterns, that can hold no water."

One is reminded of this forcible simile today when a large number of our people seem inclined to turn back to the once discarded doctrine of empires. To compare self-government with an arbitrary form of government is like comparing a living fountain with a broken cistern.

When the people are recognized as the source of power the government is perpetual, because the people endure forever. The government then responds to their desires and conforms to their character; it can

be made as good as they deserve to have and they are satisfied with it because it is their own handiwork. If it has evils those evils are endured, because the people recognize that they themselves are to blame and that it is within their power to apply any needed remedy.

A government resting on force is, on the other hand, ever unstable because it excites hatred rather than affection and is continually at war with human nature. It is in constant antagonism to that universal sentiment which is defined as the love of liberty.

All history sustains the self-evident truths which form the foundation of a government deriving its just powers from the consent of the governed. All history condemns a political structure which appeals only to fear and relies upon bayonets for its support. [*From an editorial in The Commoner.*]

SERVICE

That which is told in story by the ancient philosopher is set forth in the form of an injunction by the Master, for when his disciples asked who should be greatest in the kingdom of heaven, he answered: "Let him who would be chiefest among you be the servant of all." Thus, if we seek authority from history—whether profane or sacred—we find that he is the greatest who does the most of good. This is the law from which there is no appeal—a law confirmed by

all experience, a law proved by the inscriptions upon the monuments reared by grateful hands to those whom the world calls great.

And what an opportunity for service this age presents! If I had my choice of all the ages in which to live, I would choose the present above all others. The ocean steamer and the railway train bring all the corners of the earth close together, while the telegraph—wire and wireless—gives wings to the news and makes the events of each day known in every land during the following night. The printing press has popularized knowledge and made it possible for each one who desires it to possess a key to the libraries of the world. Invention has multiplied the strength of the human arm and brought within the reach of the masses comforts which, until recently, even wealth could not buy. The word "neighborhood" no longer describes a community; that "all ye are brethren" can be more readily comprehended than ever before. It is easier for one to distribute blessings to the world today than it was a few centuries ago to be helpful to the residents of a single valley. A good example set anywhere can be seen everywhere, so intimate has become the relation between man and man.

And yet with the wonderful spread of knowledge and the marvelous range of achievement, there is vast work to be done. Conscience has not kept pace with commerce, nor has moral growth increased with the growth of wealth. The extremes of society have been driven farther and farther apart, and the chord of sympathy between rich and poor is greatly strained.

Destitution and squalor lurk in the shadow of palaces, and great lawbreakers vie with petty thieves in ignoring the statutes of the state. The instrumentalities of government are being used for public plunder, and those who make fortunes through legislation employ a tithe of their winnings for the corruption of the sources of public opinion. Not only is a bribe dangled before the eyes of the indigent voter, but those who profit through the control of the government do not hesitate to subsidize newspapers and to scatter their hush money wherever a protest can be silenced. The opportunity is here and the field inviting. [*From address entitled "Man," delivered at the Commencement Day exercises, Nebraska State University, June 15, 1905.*]

THE TOMB OF NAPOLEON

You cannot visit Paris without being made familiar with the face of the "Little Corsican," for it stares at you from the shop windows and looks down at you from the walls of palaces and galleries.

You see the figure of "the man of destiny" in marble and bronze, sometimes on a level with the eye, sometimes piercing the sky, as it does in the Place Vendôme where it is perched on top of a lofty column whose pedestal and sides are covered with panels in relief made from cannon captured by Napoleon in battle.

The gigantic Arch of Triumph on the Champs

Elysees, commenced by Napoleon in commemoration of his successes, testifies to the splendor of his conceptions.

But overshadowing all other Napoleonic monuments is his tomb on the banks of the Seine, adjoining the Invalides. Its gilded dome attracts attention from afar, and on nearer approach one is charmed with the strength of its walls and the symmetry of its proportions. At the door the guard cautions the thoughtless to enter with uncovered head, but the admonition is seldom necessary, for an air of solemnity pervades the place. In the center of the rotunda, beneath the frescoed vault of the great dome, is a circular crypt. Leaning over the heavy marble balustrade I gazed on the massive sarcophagus below, which contains all that was mortal of that marvelous combination of intellect and will. The sarcophagus is made of dark red porphyry, a fitly chosen stone that might have been colored by the mingling of the intoxicating wine of ambition with the blood spilled to satisfy it.

Looking down upon the sarcophagus and the stands of tattered battle-flags that surround it, I reviewed the tragic career of this grand master of the art of slaughter, and weighed, as best I could, the claims made for him by his friends. And then I found myself wondering what the harvest might have been had Napoleon's genius led him along peaceful paths, had the soil of Europe been stirred by the plowshare rather than by his trenchant blade, and the reaping done by implements less destructive than his shot and shell.

Just beyond and above the entombed emperor stands

a cross upon which hangs a life-size figure of the Christ, flooded by a mellow lemon-colored light, which pours through the stained glass windows of the chapel.

I know not whether it was by accident or design that this god of war thus sleeps, as it were, at the very feet of the Prince of Peace. Whether so intended or not, it will, to those who accept the teachings of the Sermon on the Mount, symbolize love's final victory over force, and the triumph of that philosophy which finds happiness in helpful service and glory in doing good. [*From letter on France.*]

SECRET INFLUENCE

The people have nothing to fear from open enemies. The man who boldly proclaims a principle, no matter what it may be, can do but little injury. No amount of intellect, learning or eloquence can make him dangerous. As Jefferson has expressed it, "Error of opinion may be tolerated where reason is left free to combat it." Truth grows in the open field; the sunshine nourishes and strengthens it. It is secret influence which is constantly corrupting government and securing special privileges for the few at the expense of the many. The man who advocates a thing which he believes to be good for the people as a whole has no reason to conceal his purpose; but the man who tries to secure an advantage which he knows to be benefi-

cial to some class or combination but hurtful to the public, naturally and necessarily employs stealth.

Would the directors of a railroad company adopt and publish a resolution designating their favorite candidate for the legislature, congress, the senate or the bench? Would they candidly set forth why they wanted him and what they expected of him after they got him? And yet it is well known that railroads often take an active part in the selection of public officials.

Would the directors of a trust adopt and publish a resolution naming the presidential candidate they would support and announcing the contribution they would make to the campaign fund? And yet it is certain that the trusts have in the past interested themselves in campaigns.

Eternal vigilance is the price of protection against bad laws and misrule as well as the price of liberty. Since laws are made, construed and enforced by public officials, it is necessary that great care should be exercised in the selection of them in order that they, when selected, shall guard the interests of the whole people and not be the mere agents of some corporation. [*From an editorial in The Commoner.*]

LOVE'S FESTIVAL

Christmas is love's festival. Set apart for the commemoration of God's gift of His Son it has grown

into a great holiday which is observed throughout Christendom by rich and poor alike. Even those who refuse to take upon themselves the vows of any church are constrained to join in the beautiful custom which makes both parents and children look forward to this day with pleasant anticipations. For weeks before December 25th busy hands are at work, tiny savings banks are gathering in their sacred store and eager expectancy is written upon the faces of the young. To the boys and girls Santa Claus is a sort of composite donor who monopolizes the distribution of presents and who, reading the minds of his little friends, rewards the good (and all are good just before Christmas) with the very toys that they themselves have selected, while the older ones learn by experience that it is more blessed to give than to receive. Back of Christmas and the Christmas present is love, and the broad, brotherly love taught and exemplified by the Nazarene is not content with the remembrances which are exchanged as tokens of affection between members of the family and between intimate friends; it is compelling a widening of the circle to include the poor and the needy though not of kith or kin.

What an instructor love is! How it develops the one of whom it takes possession! It is the mightiest influence known among men. When once it is awakened it dissolves all opposition. Dr. Parkhurst, the New York clergyman, in illustrating the difference between force and love said (quoted from memory) that force is the hammer which can break a block of ice into a thousand pieces but leaves each piece still ice,

while love is the ray of sunlight which, though acting more slowly and silently, melts the ice.

At this season of the year our thoughts turn to the contemplation of the new degree of love revealed to the world by Jesus. To the love between members of the family and love between friends He added an all-pervading love that includes every member of the human race. Even enemies are not beyond the bounds of this love, for man's puny arms are not strong enough to break the bonds that unite each son of God to all his brethren. "Love is not stupid," says Tolstoy. It makes known to us our duty to our fellows and it will some day rule the world. Force is the weapon of the animal in us; after it comes money, which the intellect employs, sometimes for good, sometimes for harm. But greater than all is love, the weapon of the heart. It is a sword that never rusts, neither does it break, and the wounds that it leaves are life-saving, not life-destroying. No armor can withstand it and no antagonist can resist it. But why try to define this love or to measure its scope? Paul, the apostle, in his first epistle to the Corinthians describes it in language to which nothing can be added and from which nothing can be taken. Let his words suffice:

"If I speak with the tongues of men and of angels, but have not love, I am become sounding brass or clanging cymbal. And if I have the gift of prophecy, and know all the mysteries and all knowledge; and if I have all faith, so as to remove mountains, but have not love, I am nothing. And if I bestow all my goods to feed the poor, and if I give my body to be burned,

but have not love, it profiteth me nothing. Love suffereth long, and is kind; love envieth not; love vaunteth not itself, is not puffed up, doth not behave itself unseemly, seeketh not its own, is not provoked, taketh not account of evil; rejoiceth not in unrighteousness, but rejoiceth with the truth; beareth all things, believeth all things, hopeth all things, endureth all things. Love never faileth; but whether there be prophecies, they shall be done away; whether there be tongues, they shall cease; whether there be knowledge, it shall be done away with. For we know in part, and we prophesy in part, but when that which is perfect is come, that which is in part shall be done away. When I was a child, I spake as a child, I felt as a child, I thought as a child; now that I am become a man I have put away childish things. For now we see in a mirror, darkly; but then face to face; now I know in part; then shall I know even as also I have been known. But now abideth faith, hope, love, these three; and the greatest of these is love." [*From an editorial in The Commoner.*]

CRIMINAL SPECULATION

If a crime is defined as an act the doing of which is prohibited by law, stock speculation cannot be considered criminal, but when the word crime is used in its broader sense to describe an act which offends against morality or the public welfare, it certainly includes that species of gambling upon the market which en-

dangers the community as well as injures the participants. A record of Wall Street's doings for the last week is an indictment against our boasted civilization. That such transactions are allowed is as much a reflection upon the intelligence of the country as it is upon the conscience of the people. It is little less than amazing that a few men should be permitted to corner the market for their own selfish purposes, beat down the price of one stock and boom the price of another stock, demoralizing business and jeopardizing the interests of all classes of society. It is reported that the slump in stocks amounted to seven hundred millions in value, and that the New York banks had to put up nearly twenty millions of dollars to prevent a panic. How will the historian describe an age in which a petty thief is severely punished while great criminals go unwhipped? It often takes an object lesson to arouse the people to the evils of a bad system and the recent fluctuations in the stock market, costly as they have been, will be cheap if they lead to legislation which will put an end to stock gambling, erroneously described as "business." [*From an editorial in The Commoner.*]

THE EFFICACY OF EXAMPLE

If it is legitimate to "seek another's profit" and "to work another's gain," how can this service best be rendered? This has been the disputed point. Individuals and nations have differed less about the purpose to

be accomplished than about the methods to be employed. Persecutions have been carried on avowedly for the benefit of the persecuted, wars have been waged for the alleged improvement of those attacked, and still more frequently philanthropy has been adulterated with selfish interest. If the superior nations have a mission it is not to wound but to heal—not to cast down but to lift up, and the means must be example—a far more powerful and enduring means than violence. Example may be likened to the sun whose genial rays constantly coax the buried seed into life and clothe the earth, first with verdure and afterward with ripened grain, while violence is the occasional tempest which can ruin but cannot give life.

Can we doubt the efficacy of example in the light of history? There has been great increase in education during the last century and the school houses have not been opened by the bayonet; they owe their existence largely to the moral influence which neighboring nations exert upon each other. And the spread of popular government during the same period, how rapid! Constitution after constitution has been adopted and limitation after limitation has been placed upon arbitrary power until Russia, yielding to public opinion, establishes a legislative body and China sends commissions abroad with a view to inviting the people to share the responsibilities of government.

While in America and in Europe there is much to be corrected and abundant room for improvement there has never been so much altruism in the world as there is today—never so many who acknowledge the in-

dissoluble tie that binds each to every other member of the race. I have felt more pride in my own countrymen than ever before as I have visited the circuit of schools, hospitals and churches which American money has built around the world. The example of the Christian nations, though but feebly reflecting the light of the Master, is gradually reforming society.

On the walls of the temple at Karnak an ancient artist carved a picture of an Egyptian king. He is represented as holding a group of captives by the hair—one hand raising a club as if to strike them. No king would be willing to confess himself so cruel today. In some of the capitals of Europe there are monuments built from, or ornamented with, cannon taken in war. That form of boasting is still tolerated but let us hope that it will in time give way to some emblem of victory which will imply helpfulness rather than slaughter. [*From address entitled "The White Man's Burden," delivered before The American Society, London, July 4, 1906.*]

THE BUZZARD AND THE BEE

The buzzard has a strong beak, a capacious stomach and a ravenous appetite. It sometimes soars in graceful circles above the haunts of men, but it is always looking for something to eat. Its eye is sharp and its scent is keen, but all its energies are employed in procuring food—and it is not very discriminating in its

taste. In fact, it revels in carrion while it lives and when it dies leaves nothing but a foul odor to remind the world of its existence.

The bee has an instinct for sweetness; it communes daily with buds and blossoms and lives amid the perfume of the flowers. It sets an example of industry, patience and frugality; it fares well, but in addition to making its own living it leaves a storehouse full of honey to testify to its activity.

Among human beings there are some who resemble the buzzard and some who are like the bee. Some make no other use of their faculties than to search constantly for food and drink. They live in the dining room and, ignoring all appeals addressed to the head or heart, keep close to the flesh pots.

There are others—and may the swarm increase—who find pleasure in useful toil and recreation in helpfulness; they extract good from life, but they leave as a legacy to posterity more of the good than they themselves consume. Such enjoy life and add to the enjoyment of both those who live with them and those who live after them.

The buzzard must be a buzzard and the bee must be a bee—this is fate, but man is free to choose which he will imitate. [*From an editorial in The Commoner.*]

GROWTH OF DEMOCRACY

The democratic idea is growing—the term is not used in a partisan sense, but in that broader sense in

which it describes government by the people. There is not a civilized nation in which the idea of popular government is not growing, and in all the semi-civilized nations there are reformers who are urging an extension of the influence of the people in government. So universal is this growth of democratic ideas that there can be no doubt of their final triumph. Monarchies, at first unlimited, are now limited, and limited monarchies are recognizing more and more the right of the people to a voice in their own government. Monarchies and aristocracies tend toward democracy, and republics tend to become more and more democratic in their forms and methods.

When the seed, planted in the earth, sends forth the tender leaf and then the stalk; when the grain appears upon the stalk and supplies the bread necessary for the support of our bodies, we know that there is back of the seed a force irresistible and constantly working. As irresistible and as ceaseless in its activity is the force behind political and moral truth. The advocates of the American theory of government can, therefore, labor with the confident assurance that the principles planted upon American soil a century and a quarter ago are destined to grow here and everywhere until arbitrary power will nowhere be known, and until the voice of the people shall be recognized, if not as the voice of God, at least, as Bancroft defines it, as the best expression of the divine will to be found upon the earth.

In republics, as in other forms of government, there will at times be disturbances, but these come from a

failure to recognize and respect the current of public opinion. If we stand by the side of a stream and watch it glide past us, we can in safety listen to the song of the waters, but if we attempt to dam the stream we find the water rising above the dam. If we make the dam higher still, the water rises still more, and at last the force in the obstructed water is so great that no dam made by human hands can longer stay it. Sometimes, when the dam is washed away, damage is done to those who live in the valley below, but the fault is not in the stream, but in those who attempt to obstruct it. So in human society there is a current of public opinion which flows ever onward. If left to have its way it does not harm anyone, but if obstructed, this current may become a menace. At last the obstruction must yield to the force of the current. In monarchies and aristocracies the dam is sometimes built so high that it is removed by force, but in republics the ballot can be relied upon to keep the channel of the stream open, or if obstruction is attempted, to remove it while yet it can be removed with safety. The advantage of a republic is that the people, through their representatives, are able to give public opinion free play, and the more democratic a republic is, the more nearly does it conform to the wishes of the people.

No one can study the governments of the old world without a feeling of gratitude that in the new world the science of government has been carried to its highest point, and we of the United States can rejoice that our nation leads the world in recognizing the right of the

people to devise and to direct the government under which they are to work out their destiny. [*From letter on Study of Governments.*]

MISREPRESENTING THE DEMOCRAT

Just now the trust magnates are hurling epithets at those who seek to destroy the trusts. They assume to be the special custodians of property rights, and charge anti-monopolists with communistic, socialistic and anarchistic designs upon "the thrifty and the successful." As a matter of fact the reformer has never been more grossly misrepresented than he is now by the monopolists. It is the trust magnate, not the opponents of the trust, who is striking at property rights. He trespasses upon the property rights of the small manufacturer and the retailer, and heartlessly drives him into bankruptcy. He trespasses upon the property rights of the consumers, who have a right to purchase what they need in a free market at a reasonable price. The monopolist simply appropriates the property of others. The trust magnate often trespasses upon the property rights of the employe, whose skill and muscle he utilizes. He encourages the employe to invest in a home and then he sacrifices that home if he engages in a war with his laborers or finds it profitable to dismantle his plant. Even the property interests of the stockholders are not safe in the hands of the trust magnate, for he has been known to depress the market for

the purpose of freezing out his associates or in order to buy more stock at a low price. Those who, believing that "a private monopoly is indefensible and intolerable," are laboring to restore competition and to protect the small producer, the consumer, the merchant and the skilled laborer—these, not the trust magnates, are the real defenders of property rights. [*From an article published in the Saturday Evening Post in 1905.*]

PURITY IN POLITICS

While the subject of reciprocity in tariff laws is being discussed there is another kind of reciprocity which should not be overlooked, namely, reciprocity between the people and their public servants. The people owe it to their public servants to commend and encourage them when they do well, and it is not only the privilege, but the duty, of the people to condemn and rebuke officials when they betray their trust.

The public servant, on the other hand, is under obligation to the people who elect him and to the party which he represents. When he becomes the agent of the people to carry out their will, he takes an oath that he will be honest and faithful. If he violates that oath he ought not to expect the people to be more considerate of his feelings than he has been of their rights. If he sells them out he has no reason to complain if they turn him out. If he has received his price he ought not to complain if they pursue their remedy and

select some one else to represent them. Why should a party support an official who has brought disgrace upon it by his unfaithfulness? If his devotion to his party is not sufficient to make him behave himself, his party ought not to be so devoted to him as to shield him from deserved punishment.

When a good official falls, his party cannot escape some censure even though the official's previous record was such as to justify the party's confidence, but a party cannot defend an official after his fall without assuming responsibility for his sins. Neither is it incumbent upon a party to incur risk in defending a member of the party against charges not yet proved in court. Purity in politics requires not merely that officials shall keep out of the penitentiary, but that they shall be above suspicion. If under suspicion let them step aside until the cloud is removed. When an official shows the first symptoms of that disastrous official disease known as "the itching palm" he should be quarantined until he is entirely recovered or until it is shown that he did not have the disease. If he is a manly man he will prefer seclusion during the investigation and his vindication will be the more complete when it comes, but the party by taking the suspicion upon itself will so weaken itself that it cannot be of service to him even after vindication.

The democratic party has suffered occasionally because of corrupt officials in city, county, state and nation. As a matter of policy as well as a matter of principle it ought to make an example of every guilty democrat. It will by so doing win the confidence of

the people and by warning democratic officials that punishment follows wrongdoing, it will lessen the number of betrayals.

Let every honest democrat resolve to fearlessly prosecute every corrupt democratic official and thus make the party stand for public honor and fidelity to public interests. This advice is especially applicable to Pennsylvania politics. Even republican papers are open in their charges of corruption in high places and it is evident that some of the democrats have been besmirched by republican corruptionists. The party should be purged of these ungrateful and odorous misrepresentatives. Pennsylvania politics needs purifying and the democratic party must purge itself of these rotten members if it expects to be a potent factor in the cleansing of the state. [*From an editorial in The Commoner.*]

UNION

I am told that in this county were fought more battles than in any county of like size in the world, and that upon the earth within the limits of this county there fell more dead and wounded than ever fell on a similar space in all the history of the world. Here opposing lines were drawn up face to face; here opposing armies met and stared at each other and then sought to take each other's lives. But all these scenes have passed away and those who once met in deadly array now meet and commingle here as friends. Here

the swords have been turned into plowshares, here the spears have been converted into pruning hooks and people learn war no more. Here the bands on either side once stirred up the flagging zeal with notes that thrilled the hearts of men. These two bands are now component parts of one great band, and as that band marches on in the lead playing "Yankee Doodle" and "Dixie" too, the war-scarred veterans who wore the blue and the war-scarred veterans who wore the gray follow, side by side, each vying with the other in the effort to make this the greatest and the best of all the nations on God's footstool. [*From speech delivered at Fredericksburg, Va., during the campaign of 1896.*]



A generation ago New England helped to free the black slaves of the South, and today the Southern people rejoice that it was accomplished. The time has come when the Southern people are helping to free the white slaves of the North; and in the fullness of time New England will rejoice in its accomplishment. Thomas Jefferson, although a Virginian, favored emancipation, and yet that sentiment, born in the South, ripened and developed in the North until it came down and conquered the land from which it sprung.

The idea of commercial freedom had its birthplace in the North, but it has spread over the States of the South and West, and it will come back from these great sections and conquer the land in which it had its

birth. Let us not stir anew the dying embers of civil strife. I did not live through those days. It was not my good fortune to be permitted to show my loyalty to the Union or my devotion to a State; and there are over all the South young men who have grown to manhood since the war; and they, and their fathers rejoice today in the results of the war, achieved against their objection. These men do not deserve your scorn; they do not merit your contempt. They are ready to fight side by side with you, shoulder to shoulder, in making this the most glorious nation that the world has ever seen. I have no doubt of the loyalty of the South, and I honor the sentiments so eloquently expressed the other day by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. Black) when he spoke in praise of the flag which he at one time disowned.

These gentlemen from the South, sir, who speak for union and fraternal love, and the men from the North who echo their sentiments, reflect the wishes of the people of this country far more accurately than the political volcanoes which break into active eruption every two years. Welcome to these sons of the South! We gladly join them in every work which has for its object equality, freedom and justice. And I rejoice that the people of these once estranged sections are prepared to celebrate the complete reunion of the North and South so beautifully described by the poetess when she says:

“Together,” shouts Niagara, his thunder-toned decree;
“Together,” echo back the waves upon the Mexic sea;

“Together,” sing the sylvan hills where old Atlantic
roars;
“Together,” boom the breakers on the wild Pacific
shores;
“Together,” cry the people, and “together” it shall be,
An everlasting charter-bond forever for the free;
Of Liberty the signet-seal, the one eternal sign,
Be those united emblems—the Palmetto and the Pine.

[*From speech delivered in House of Representatives,
January 13, 1894.*]

THE DOCTRINES OF THE NAZARENE

The tokens of love and affection exchanged during the Christmas season are small when compared with the great gift brought to humanity by the meek and lowly Nazarene in whose honor Christmas day is observed.

To the Christian, Jesus came as an unspeakable gift, His face illumined by a divine radiance, His life surrendered in fulfillment of a divine plan, His resurrection fixing in the firmament a star of hope that shall never be dimmed. But even those outside of the church, as well as its members, share in the benefit which humanity has received from the example and teachings of the Man of Galilee.

In a letter written to a friend, Thomas Jefferson analyzed the doctrines of Christ as they relate to man's conduct toward his fellows, saying:

“His moral doctrines, relating to kindred and friends, were more pure and perfect than those of the most correct of the philosophers, and greatly more so than those of the Jews; and they went far beyond both in inculcating universal philanthropy, not only to kindred and friends, to neighbors and countrymen, but to all mankind, gathering all into one family, under the bonds of love, charity, peace, common wants and common aids. A development of this head will evince the peculiar superiority of the system of Jesus over all others.

“The precepts of philosophy and of the Hebrew code laid hold of action only. He pushed his scrutinies into the heart of man; created his tribunal in the region of his thought, and purified the waters at the fountain head.”

Those who accept Jesus as the Son of God and worship Him as such can attribute the marvelous spread of His gospel to a supernatural force behind it; those, however, who dispute His divinity must find in the doctrines themselves an explanation of their increasing hold upon the human heart. No language that can be employed by pen, no words that can be spoken by the tongue, can exaggerate the influence which Christ's philosophy has already exerted upon the race, or estimate its future power.

Between the doctrine of might and the doctrine of right; between the principle that propagates itself by the sword and the principle that grows through the persuasive influence of its own intrinsic merit; between the grasping, over-reaching spirit that enthrones self

and sacrifices all else to its own advantage and the generous, manly recognition of the rights of others; between a measure of greatness that estimates a man by what he has absorbed from society and that which estimates men worthy in proportion as they do service and diffuse blessings—these differences surpass comprehension.

If Jesus had left nothing but the Parables, His name would have been imperishable in literature; if He had bequeathed to posterity nothing but the simplicity of his speech and the irresistible logic of His argument, He would have had a permanent place among the orators of the world; if He had given to the world nothing but the commandment "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself," enforced as it was by His own example, this one gift would have been sufficient to outweigh all the wealth of all the world; if He had left no record but the Sermon on the Mount, it alone would have made His natal day worthy of perpetual celebration—but all these, added to the matchless majesty of a perfect life and the inspiring influence of an all-pervading love, are turning the eyes of an ever-increasing number to the path that He trod from the manger to the cross.

Love was the dominating force of His life and love is today the overmastering impulse whose ebb and flow mark the retreat and advance of civilization. And love, too, sanctifies the Christmas gift. With it the merest trifle swells into an object of importance; without it the most expensive present dwindles into insignificance. Love is the alchemy which invests with priceless value

all that it touches—the magic wand that converts the humblest cottage into a palace and gives to earth's pilgrims a glimpse of paradise. [*From an editorial in The Commoner.*]

ORATORY

During Revolutionary days the Old Dominion furnished not only the first, but the greatest of our executives. During the Revolutionary days Virginia furnished the greatest of all statesmen—not of that period alone, but of all time; for no other statesman, before or since, stands in the class with Thomas Jefferson. But, not satisfied with presenting the greatest executive and statesman, Virginia presented an orator worthy to be classed with Demosthenes, who has for more than twenty centuries been the world's model in public speaking. As an impassioned orator, even Demosthenes was not superior to Patrick Henry.

Sometimes I receive a letter from a student who tells me that he is a born orator, and wants to know what such an one should do to prepare himself for his life work. I generally reply that orators must be born like other people, but that birth is the smallest part of an orator's equipment. Men are not born orators. If I want to calculate the future of a young man in public speaking, I do not ask him whether his mother spoke well, or his father spoke a great deal; I do not think it makes much difference. An orator is a product of his time, and there are and always will be

orators when there are great interests at stake, and when men arise with a message to deliver.

There are two essentials in oratory; first that the man shall know what he is talking about, and second, that he shall mean what he says. You can not have eloquence without these two essentials. If a man does not know a thing, he can not tell it—if he is not informed himself, he can not inform others; and if he does not feel in his own heart, he can not make anybody else feel.

And next to these two, I would place clearness of statement. There are not only certain self-evident truths, but all truth is self-evident, and the best service one can render truth is to present it so clearly that it can be understood, for if the truth is clearly stated you do not need to defend it, it defends itself.

I do not mean to say that any truth can be so clearly stated that no one will dispute it. I think it was Lord Macaulay who said that if any money was to be made by it, learned men would be found to dispute the laws of gravitation. But what I mean to say is this, that a truth can be so clearly stated that no one will dispute it unless he has some reason for disputing it,—sometimes a pecuniary reason, sometimes a reason founded upon prejudice or some other selfish interest,—and when you find a man disputing a self-evident truth there is no use arguing with him; it is a waste of time. Argue with some one who is open to conviction. For instance, if you say to a man, "It is wrong to steal," a self-evident truth, and he says, "I do not know about that," it is no use to argue with him—

search him, and you will probably find the reason in his pocket.

Next to clearness of statement, I would put conciseness of statement—the saying much in a few words.

Patrick Henry had all of these qualities. He knew what he was talking about, he understood the fundamental principles of the science of government; he understood human rights, and he understood the human heart. He not only knew what he was talking about, but he meant what he said—he spoke from his heart to the hearts of those who listened. There were learned and influential men in those days who opposed him, but when he made his impassioned appeal to the sense of justice he was greater than all of them. He had the power of stating a question clearly. He could strip away the verbiage that is sometimes used to conceal ideas, he could present the idea clearly, and he could present a thought in a few words. No great thought has ever been more strongly presented, more clearly presented, more concisely presented than that great thought which he presented when he exclaimed: “Give me liberty or give me death!” He might have spoken for hours, but he could not have added to the strength of the statement by the use of further words. He was a great orator, and his influence rested upon his ability to speak to the hearts of the people. He did not speak for himself, no orator can speak for himself and be eloquent. He must have a larger cause.

If a man is to be eloquent he must speak for mankind; only then can he appeal to the hearts of men. A man is of little importance in this world, except as he

can advance a principle, or help his fellows. Patrick Henry seized a great principle and brought it into prominence. He spoke not for himself, but for all the people of this country—he was the voice of the people, he was the conscience of the masses, and therefore when he spoke for them he carried conviction. He presented in a few words the greatest theme that we have to deal with in matters of government. [*From speech at the Jamestown Exposition, May 30, 1907.*]

A BADGE OF SHAME

The free pass is one of the great evils of the day, and no public official is in a position to discharge his duty to the people if he places himself under obligations to the corporations.

The battle against the free pass is not a temporary struggle. Unless we are prepared to confess that popular government is a farce, that battle will not cease until the pass has been abolished.

In the meantime let it be understood everywhere that a free pass in the hands of a public official is a badge of shame. [*From an editorial in The Commoner.*]

PROTECTING PROPERTY RIGHTS

The democratic party is not the enemy of property or of property rights; it is, on the contrary, the best

defender of both, because it defends human rights, and human rights are the only foundation upon which property and property rights can rest securely. The democratic party does not menace a single dollar legitimately accumulated; on the contrary, it insists upon the protection of rich and poor alike in the enjoyment of that which they have honestly earned. The democratic party does not discourage thrift, but on the contrary stimulates each individual to the highest endeavor by assuring him that he will not be deprived of the fruits of his toil.

If we can but repeal the laws which enable men to reap where they have not sown—laws which enable them to garner into their overflowing barns the harvests that belong to others—no one will be able to accumulate enough to make his fortune dangerous to the country. Special privilege and the use of the taxing power for private gain—these are the twin pillars upon which plutocracy rests. To take away these supports and to elevate the beneficiaries of special legislation to the plane of honest effort ought to be the purpose of our party.

And who can suffer injury by just taxation, impartial laws and the application of the Jeffersonian doctrine of equal rights to all and special privileges to none? Only those whose accumulations are stained with dishonesty and whose immoral methods have given them a distorted view of business, of society and government. Accumulating by conscious frauds more money than they can use upon themselves, wisely distribute or safely leave to their children, these denounce

as public enemies all who question their methods or throw a light upon their crimes. [*From Madison Square Garden, New York, speech, August 30, 1906.*]

THE FIRST VOTER

Young man, great responsibility attaches to your first vote. As you begin, so you are likely to continue. The momentum that carries you into a party at the beginning of your political life is apt to keep you in that party unless some convulsion shakes you out of it. Start right, and in order that you may start right, examine the principles of the parties and the policies which they advocate.

There are two great party organizations in the United States, one fifty years old, and the other more than a century old. The republican party has been in power almost uninterruptedly for more than half a century, and under its reign abuses have grown up which threaten the perpetuity of the government and endanger our civilization. So great are these abuses that republican reformers are now pointing out that something must be done—and what can be done? The first thing is to undo the things that have been done, and the party to undo these abuses is not the party which has done them, but the party which has protested against these abuses and pointed out remedies.

The republican party has turned the taxing power over to private individuals; it has allowed monopolies

to grow up and assume control of the industries of the country by granting privileges by law and by giving immunity to the large violators of the law; the republican party has permitted the fortunes of the predatory rich to become so large that government is corrupted, politics debauched and business polluted.

The democratic party proposes to withdraw the taxing power from private hands, to so legislate as to make a private monopoly impossible, and to enforce the law without discrimination. It proposes to protect legitimate wealth and punish those who attempt to plunder the public for private gain. On which side do you stand, young man? Are you with the masses in their effort to restore the government to its old foundation and make it a government of the people, for the people, and by the people, or are you with the republican leaders in their effort to perpetuate the party in power by selling immunity in return for campaign contributions?

There are always two parties in the country, and one is necessarily nearer to the people than the other. In this country the democratic party is nearer to the people than the republican party. Its leaders have more faith in the people and are more anxious to keep the government under the control of the people. Take the election of United States senators by the people as a test. The democrats want to give to the voters a chance to elect and to control their representatives in the United States senate. The democratic party in the house of representatives passed the first resolution for the submission of the necessary constitutional

amendment. They did this eight years before any republican congress did it. The democratic party has twice demanded this reform in its national platform. The republican party has not done so. Why do democratic leaders insist upon this reform and republican leaders oppose it? There can be but one answer—the democratic party is nearer to the people than the republican party. Young man, will you stand with the people or against them?

The answer to this question affects your country. If you are with the people your influence, be it great or small, will hasten their victory. If you are against the people, your influence may retard that victory. But while in the first instance it is your country that may gain or lose by your action, you must remember that in the long run your own position in politics will depend upon your conduct. You can not fool the people always. You may lead them astray if you dare, but they will punish you when they find you out. You may work for the people without their recognizing it at first, but you can trust them to discover the character of your work and to reward you accordingly. [*From an editorial in The Commoner.*]

TRIBUTE TO JEFFERSON

There are wrongs to be righted; there are evils to be eradicated; there is injustice to be removed; there is good to be secured for those who toil and wait. In

this fight for equal laws we cannot fail, for right is mighty and will in time triumph over all obstacles. Even if our own eyes do not behold success we know that our labor is not in vain, and we can lay down our weapons, happy in the promise given by Bryant to the soldier:

“Yea, though thou lie upon the dust,
When they who helped thee flee in fear,
Die full of hope and manly trust,
Like those who fell in battle here.

“Another hand thy sword shall wield;
Another hand the standard wave;
Till from the trumpet’s mouth is pealed
The blast of triumph o’er thy grave.”

Let us, then, with the courage of Andrew Jackson, apply to present conditions the principles taught by Thomas Jefferson—Thomas Jefferson, the greatest constructive statesman whom the world has ever known; the grandest warrior who ever battled for human liberty! He quarried from the mountain of eternal truth the four pillars upon whose strength all popular government must rest. In the Declaration of American Independence he proclaimed the principles with which there is, without which there cannot be, “a government of the people, by the people, and for the people.” When he declared that “all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are

life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; that to secure these rights governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed," he declared all that lies between the Alpha and Omega of democracy.

Alexander "wept for other worlds to conquer," after he had carried his victorious banner throughout the then known world; Napoleon "rearranged the map of Europe with his sword" amid the lamentations of those by whose blood he was exalted; but when these and other military heroes are forgotten and their achievements disappear in the cycle's sweep of years, children will still lisp the name of Jefferson, and free-men will ascribe due praise to him who filled the kneeling subject's heart with hope and bade him stand erect—a sovereign among his peers. [*From speech delivered in House of Representatives, June 5, 1894.*]

DOCTRINE OF ELECTION

There is one thing about the Presbyterian Church that I did not like, but I have had an explanation of it recently that makes me accept that; so I am in a very genial frame of mind so far as churches are concerned. The one thing that I did not like about the Presbyterian church was the doctrine of election. I have had a good deal of trouble with that—religiously, and otherwise—but I heard an explanation of the doctrine of election that has reconciled me to it, and in

the hope that there may be some Presbyterians here who can be helped by it, I will tell you this story:

Two colored preachers down in Georgia were discussing religion, as they are wont to do sometimes, and the Presbyterian brother was trying to persuade the Methodist, and the Methodist brother hung back on the doctrine of election. The Presbyterian brother said: "It's just this way—the voting is going on all the time; the Lord is voting for you and the devil is voting against you, and whichever way you vote, that's the way the election goes."

It is the best definition of the doctrine of election that I know of. [*From address entitled "Democracy's Appeal to Culture," delivered before the Alumni Association of Syracuse University, at Hotel Astor, New York, January 27, 1905.*]

"A DREAM IN MARBLE"

Of all the works of art that can be traced to the genius of Shah Jehan, nothing compares with the Tomb, the Taj Mahal, which he reared in honor of the best-loved of his wives, Numtaj Mahal, "the chosen of the palace." This building, unique among buildings and alone in its class, has been described so often that I know not how to speak of it without employing language already hackneyed. When I was a student at college I heard a lecturer describe this wonderful tomb, and it was one of the objective points in our visit to

India. Since I first heard of it I had read so much of it, and had received such glowing accounts from those who had seen it, that I feared lest the expectations aroused might be disappointed.

We reached Agra toward midnight, and, as the moon was waning, drove at once to the Taj that we might see it under the most favorable conditions, for in the opinion of many it is most beautiful by moonlight. There is something fascinating in the view which it thus presents, and we feasted our eyes upon it. Shrouded in the mellow light, the veins of the marble and the stains of more than two and a half centuries are invisible, and it stands forth like an apparition. We visited it again in the day time, and yet again, and found that the sunlight increased rather than diminished its grandeur. I am bringing an alabaster miniature home with me, but I am conscious that the Taj must be seen full size and silhouetted against the sky to be appreciated.

Imagine a garden with flowers and lawn, walks and marble water basins and fountains; in this garden build a platform of white marble eighteen feet high and three hundred feet square, with an ornamented minaret one hundred and thirty-seven feet high at each corner; in the center of this platform rear a building one hundred and eighty feet square and a hundred feet high, with its corners beveled off and, like the sides, recessed into bays; surmount it with a large central dome and four smaller ones; cover it inside and out with inlaid work of many colored marbles and carvings of amazing delicacy; beneath the central

dome place two marble centetaphs, inlaid with precious stones, the tombs of Shah Jehan and his wife, and enclose them in exquisitely carved marble screens—imagine all this, if you can, and then your conception of this world-famed structure will fall far below the Taj Mahal itself.

It is, indeed, “a dream in marble.” And yet, when one looks upon it and then surveys the poverty and ignorance of the women who live within its shadow, he is tempted to ask whether the builder of the Taj might not have honored his wife more had the six million dollars invested in this tomb been expended on the elevation of womanhood. The contrast between this artistic pile and the miserable tenements of the people about it robs the structure of half its charms. [*From letter on Mohammedan India.*]

MAN'S LIMITATIONS

Man is a religious being; the heart instinctively seeks for a God. Whether he worships on the banks of the Ganges, prays with his face toward the sun, kneels toward Mecca or, regarding all space as a temple, communes with the Heavenly Father according to the Christian creed, man is essentially devout.

Some regard religion as a superstition, pardonable in the ignorant but unworthy of the educated—a mental state which one can and should outgrow. Those who hold this view look down with mild contempt

upon such as give to religion a definite place in their thoughts and lives. They assume an intellectual superiority and often take little pains to conceal the assumption. Tolstoy administers to the "cultured crowd" (the words quoted are his) a severe rebuke when he declares that the religious sentiment rests not upon a superstitious fear of the invisible forces of nature, but upon man's consciousness of his finiteness amid an infinite universe and of his sinfulness; and this consciousness, the great philosopher adds, man can never outgrow. Tolstoy is right; man recognizes how limited are his own powers and how vast is the universe, and he leans upon the arm that is stronger than his. Man feels the weight of his sins and looks for One who is sinless.

Religion has been defined as the relation which man fixes between himself and his God, morality being the outward manifestation of this relation. Every one, by the time he reaches maturity, has fixed some relation between himself and God and no material change in this relation can take place without a revolution in the man, for this relation is the supreme thing in his life. [*From "The Prince of Peace," an address delivered on various occasions.*]

A CHILD'S INFLUENCE

What unfathomed possibilities are wrapped within the swaddling clothes that enfold an infant! Who

can measure a child's influence for weal or woe? Before it can lisp a word, it has brought to one woman the sweet consciousness of motherhood, and it has given to one man the added strength that comes with a sense of responsibility. Before its tiny hands can lift a feather's weight, they have drawn two hearts closer together and its innocent prattle echoes through two lives. Every day that child in its growth touches and changes someone; not a year in all its history but that it leaves an impress upon the race. Its smiles, its tears, its joys, its sorrows—all are garnered up, and when that child reaches the age of 15 or 16 and the parents send it to college, they entrust this priceless creature to the care of teachers. What do you do with it? How do you deal with it? Train it in the sciences? Train it in the languages? It is not sufficient that the child shall know how old the earth is, how far the stars are apart, or the forces that attract or repel each other. There is something more important to that child than any or all of these—it is to know how to live, and how can that child know how to live unless it knows that it is linked by indissoluble ties to every other human being? Great is the responsibility of the college? The college ought to send forth, not simply scholars, but men and women prepared to do a great work. If a man standing upon an eminence sees danger afar, you condemn him if he does not warn those in the valley of the danger's approach. Are the scholars of this land, standing upon eminences, watching and warning their fellows? I fear that too many of them are satisfied to simply enjoy life—satisfied simply to accumulate, re-

garding their education as a private possession that they can use as they please. I must learn again my religion—whether it be Methodist or Presbyterian, or taught in any other church—before I can accept this doctrine in regard to man. [*From address entitled "Democracy's Appeal to Culture," delivered before the Alumni Association of Syracuse University, at Hotel Astor, New York, January 27, 1905.*]

THE SECRET OF LIFE

Science has taught us so many things that we are tempted to conclude that we know everything, but there is really a great unknown which is still unexplored and that which we have learned ought to increase our reverence rather than our egotism. Science has disclosed some of the machinery of the universe, but science has not yet revealed to us the great secret—the secret of life. It is to be found in every blade of grass, in every insect, in every bird and in every animal, as well as in man. Six thousand years of recorded history and yet we know no more about the secret of life than they knew in the beginning. We live, we plan; we have our hopes, our fears; and yet in a moment a change may come over any one of us and then this body will become a mass of lifeless clay. What is it that, having, we live, and having not we are as the clod? We know not, and yet the progress of the race and the civilization which we now behold are the work

of men and women who have not solved the mystery of their own lives.

And our food, must we understand it before we eat it? If we refused to eat anything until we could understand the mystery of its growth, we would die of starvation. But mystery does not bother us in the dining room; it is only in the church that it is an obstacle.

I was eating a piece of watermelon some months ago and was struck with its beauty. I took some of the seeds and weighed them, and found that it would require some five thousand seeds to weigh a pound. And then I applied mathematics to a forty-pound melon. One of these seeds, put into the ground, when warmed by the sun and moistened by the rain goes to work; it gathers from somewhere two hundred thousand times its own weight and, forcing this raw material through a tiny stem, constructs a watermelon. It covers the outside with a coating of green; inside of the green it puts a layer of white, and within the white a core of red, and all through the red it scatters seeds each one capable of continuing the work of reproduction. I can not explain the watermelon but I eat it and enjoy it. Everything that grows tells a like story of infinite power. Why should I deny that a divine hand fed a multitude with a few loaves and fishes when I see hundreds of millions fed every year by a hand which converts the seeds scattered over the field into an abundant harvest? We know that food can be multiplied in a few months' time; shall we deny the power of the Creator to eliminate the element of

time, when we have gone so far in eliminating the element of space? [*From "The Prince of Peace," an address delivered on various occasions.*]

THE CHILDREN'S LEGACY

I have given you a few evidences of growth that encourage men to believe that better times are coming for those who want purity in politics and a government responsive to the will of the people.

And now let me give you what I regard as even a more encouraging sign; that is, the activity of the well-to-do men on the people's side of these questions, for these reforms have generally heretofore found their advocacy among the poor people. I regard it as a splendid sign that men of independent means, men who have no fear for themselves or for their own positions, are beginning to recognize that there is something in this world more important than the making of money, and that these men are beginning to give to those questions the benefit of their business experience and of their brain. In the last few years I have been gratified beyond measure to have men of means come to me and tell me of their interest in these reforms, altruistic interest, if you please, unselfish interest; men not seeking public office; men asking for nothing in the way of favors from the government, but men who recognize that this government must be better than it has been if we are to leave the legacy we ought to leave to our children.

I am glad, my friends, to find this increasing number, and I want to look upon these questions as these men do, for I am in an independent position. My poverty was overestimated when they called me poor just as my wealth is overestimated now, when they call me rich. I was never so poor that I could not have everything I needed, and my wants are as simple now, and my tastes as modest as when I was a struggling young lawyer and my wife and I were doing our work together. I have no fear about my income, no doubt that I can take care of myself, no doubt that I can leave my children as much as I think I ought to leave them. I do not believe in leaving children much. I am glad my father did not leave me much, for if I had grown up in anticipation of a fortune I would not have developed the industry that I did develop when I found that I had to make my own living. I do not want my children to be spoiled by the expectation of a great deal of money; I shall be able to leave them enough.

Why should a man want to leave only money to his children? If you leave money it may take the wings of the morning and fly away. You must leave your children something better than money. There is a growing class in this country, an increasing number of our citizens, who recognize that the best legacy a father can leave to his children is not fortune, but a government that will protect his children in their enjoyment of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness, and guarantee to them a fair share of the proceeds of their own toil.

I welcome, therefore, as allies in the great fight that we have before us, not only the poor who have felt the pressure of bad laws, but also those well-to-do people whose hearts beat in sympathy with the hearts of the struggling masses; and I am glad to have these two classes stand side by side and fight shoulder to shoulder. The fact that they are doing it in increasing numbers is evidence of the truth of what Dumas wrote thirteen years ago and Tolstoy ten years ago. They declared the coming of an era of brotherhood.

I rejoice that I have lived to see this day when men of means are recognizing that the poor man is made in the image of the same God whose image the well-to-do man wears; that these men are recognizing that the poor man loves his children as much as the rich man loves his children. This recognition of kinship will enable us to solve these questions in the spirit of brotherly love and, solving them, give an impetus to progress and civilization. [*From a speech at banquet given by People's Lobby, Newark, New Jersey, May 5, 1907.*]

HUMANITY'S SEARCH FOR PEACE

All the world is in search of peace; every heart that ever beat has sought peace and many have been the methods employed to find it. Some have thought to purchase it with riches and they have labored to secure wealth, hoping to find peace when they were able to go where they pleased and buy what they

liked. Of those who have endeavored to purchase peace with money, the large majority have failed to secure the money. But what has been the experience of those who have been successful in accumulating money? They all tell the same story, viz., that they spend the first half of their lives trying to get money from others and the last half trying to keep others from getting their money, and that they found peace in neither half. Some have even reached the point where they find difficulty in getting people to accept their money; and I know of no better indication of the ethical awakening in this country than the increasing tendency to scrutinize the methods of money making. A long step in advance will have been taken when religious, educational and charitable institutions refuse to condone immoral methods in business and leave the possessor of ill-gotten gains to learn the loneliness of life when one prefers money to morals.

Some have sought peace in social distinction, but whether they have been within the charmed circle and fearful lest they might fall out, or outside and hopeful that they might get in, they have not found peace.

Some have thought, vain thought! to find peace in political prominence; but whether office comes by birth as in monarchies or by election as in republics, it does not satisfy a selfish ambition. An office is conspicuous only when few can occupy it. But few in a generation can hope to be the chief executive of their city, state or nation. I am glad that our Heavenly Father did not make the peace of the

human heart depend upon the accumulation of wealth, or upon the securing of social or political distinction, for in either case but few could have enjoyed it, but when He made peace the reward of a conscience void of offense toward God and man, He put it within the reach of all. The poor can secure it as easily as the rich, the social outcast as freely as the leader of society and the humblest citizen equally with those who wield political power. [*From "The Prince of Peace," an address delivered on various occasions.*]

REAL GREATNESS

Christ has given us a measure of greatness which eliminates conflicts. When His disciples disputed among themselves as to which should be greatest in the kingdom of heaven, He rebuked them and said, "Let him who would be chiefest among you be the servant of all." Service is the measure of greatness; it always has been true, it is true today, and it always will be true, that he is greatest who does the most of good. And yet, what a revolution it will work in this old world when this standard becomes the standard of every life. Nearly all of our controversies and combats arise from the fact that we are trying to get something from each other—there will be peace when our aim is to do something for each other. Our enmities and animosities arise from our efforts to get as much as possible out of the world—there will be peace when

our endeavor is to put as much as possible into the world. Society will have taken an immeasurable step toward peace when it estimates a citizen by his output rather than by his income and gives the crown of its approval to the one who makes the largest contribution to the welfare of all. [*From "The Prince of Peace," an address delivered by Mr. Bryan on various occasions.*]

FAITH

Man needs faith in God, therefore, to strengthen him in his hours of trial, and he needs it to give him courage to do the work of life. How can one fight for a principle unless he believes in the triumph of the right? How can he believe in the triumph of the right if he does not believe that God stands back of the truth and that God is able to bring victory to truth? The man of faith, believing that every word spoken for truth will have its influence and that no blow struck for righteousness is struck in vain, fights on without asking whether he is to fall in the beginning of the battle or to live to join in the shouts of triumph. He knows not whether he is to live for the truth or to die for it, and if he has the faith he ought to have, he is as ready to die for it as to live for it.

Faith will not only give you strength when you fight for righteousness, but your faith will bring dismay to your enemies. There is power in the pres-

ence of an honest man who does right because it is right and dares to do the right in the face of all opposition. It is true today, and has been true through all history that "One, with God, shall chase a thousand; and two, put ten thousand to flight."

If your preparation is complete so that you feel conscious of your ability to do great things; if you have faith in your fellowmen, and become a colaborer with them in the raising of the general level of society; if you have faith in our form of government, and seek to purge it of its imperfections so as to make it more and more acceptable to our own people and to the oppressed of other nations; and if in addition you have faith in God and in the triumph of the right, no one can set limits to your achievements. This is the greatest of all the ages in which to live. The railroads and telegraph wires have brought the corners of the earth close together, and it is easier today for one to be helpful to the whole world than it was a few centuries ago to be helpful to the inhabitants of a single valley. This is the age of great opportunity and of great responsibility. Let your faith be large, and let this large faith inspire you to perform a large service. [*From an address delivered at various college commencements, during 1906 and entitled "Faith."*]

DREAMERS

It is the fate of those who stand in a position of leadership to receive credit which really belongs to

their co-workers. Even the enemies of a public man exaggerate the importance of his work without, of course, intending it. I have recently been a victim of this exaggeration. Senator Beveridge, of Indiana, made a speech before the Republican Club of Lincoln and in it he paid me some compliments; but he said that I was merely a dreamer while President Roosevelt did things. But it is something to be a dreamer. I did not pay much attention to the title which he gave me until I read shortly afterwards that Speaker Cannon called me a dreamer; then Governor Cummins called me a dreamer, and then Governor Hanley, of Indiana, did also; and I saw that I could not expect acquittal with four such witnesses against me, and so I decided to plead guilty and justify.

I went to the Bible for authority, as I am in the habit of doing, for I have never found any other book which contains so much of truth or in which truth is so well expressed; and then, too, there is another reason why I quote scripture: When I quote democratic authority, the republicans attack my authority and they keep me so busy defending the men from whom I quote that I do not have time to do the work I want to do, but when I quote scripture and they attack my authority, I can let them fight it out with the Bible while I go on about my business.

The Bible tells of dreamers, and among the most conspicuous was Joseph. He told his dreams to his brothers, and his brothers hated him because of his dreams. And one day when his father sent him out where his brothers were keeping their flocks in Dothan,

they saw him coming afar off and said: "Behold, the dreamer cometh." They plotted to kill him—and he is not the only dreamer who has been plotted against in this old world. But finally they decided that instead of killing him they would put him down in a pit, but some merchants passing that way, the brothers decided to sell him to the merchants, and the merchants carried Joseph down into Egypt.

The brothers deceived their father and made him think the wild beasts had devoured his son.

Time went on and the brothers had almost forgotten the dreamer Joseph. But a famine came—yes, a famine—and then they had to go down into Egypt and buy corn, and when they got there, they found the dreamer—and he had the corn.

So I decided that it was not so bad after all for one to be a dreamer—if one has the corn.

But the more I thought of the dreamer's place in history, the less I felt entitled to the distinction.

John Boyle O'Reilly says that

"The dreamer lives forever,
While the toiler dies in a day."

And is it not true?

In traveling through Europe you find great cathedrals, and back of each there was a dreamer. An architect had a vision of a temple of worship and he put that vision upon paper. Then the builders began, and they laid stone upon stone and brick upon brick until finally the temple was completed—completed sometimes centuries after the dreamer's death. And people

now travel from all corners of the world to look upon the temple, and the name of the dreamer is known while the names of the toilers are forgotten.

No, I cannot claim a place among the dreamers, but there has been a great dreamer in the realm of statesmanship—Thomas Jefferson. He saw a nation bowed beneath oppression and he had a vision of a self-governing people among whom every citizen was a sovereign, and where no one dared or cared to wear a crown. He put his vision upon paper and for more than a century multitudes have been building. They are building at this temple in every nation; some day it will be completed and then the people of all the world will find protection beneath its roof and security within its walls. I shall be content if, when my days are numbered, it can be truthfully said of me that with such ability as I possessed, and whenever opportunity offered, I labored faithfully with the multitude to build this building higher in my time. [*From a speech delivered at Lincoln, November, 1906.*]

PENSIONS

The party expresses its pride in the soldiers and sailors of all our wars, and declares its purpose to deal generously with them and their dependents. A liberal policy is natural and necessary in a government which depends upon a citizen soldiery, instead of a large standing army. Self-interest, as well as grati-

tude, compels the government to make bountiful provision for those who, in the hour of danger, and at great sacrifice of business, health and life, tender their services to their country.

The pension laws should be construed according to the generous spirit which prompted their passage. The platform very properly reiterates the position taken in 1896, that the fact of enlistment shall be deemed conclusive evidence that the soldier was sound when the government accepted him. A certificate given now to the health of a person 40 years ago, even if easily obtainable, should not have as much weight as the certificate of the medical officer who examined the volunteer with a view of ascertaining his fitness for army service. [*Letter of acceptance, 1900.*]

A -CENTRAL BANK.

It cannot be denied that the tendency among our great financiers is toward the establishment of just such a bank as is proposed by Mr. Morgan (a central bank). Such a bank would be able to control not only the purse strings of the nation but the purse strings of the people. Because of this enormous power, such a bank would be able to control elections, dictate government policies, crush great principles and shape the business of the country according to the ends and advantages of those in authority in this central bank.

Such a bank, if these men had their way, would be

endowed with money-issuing powers "without the prerequisite of bond deposits."

There are many things nowadays which threaten the welfare of the people, but of all of the propositions so far made none promise greater detriment than the suggestion that there be established in this country a Nick Biddle institution.

And yet it may be that out of the threatened disaster great good will come. The creation of another Nick Biddle may thus provide a call for another Andrew Jackson; and at no time in its history has this country been so sadly in need of a man of Jackson's mould as it is today. [*From an editorial in The Commoner.*]

ELECTION OF UNITED STATES SENATORS

I return more strongly convinced than before of the importance of a change in the methods of electing United States senators. There is noticeable everywhere a distinct movement toward democracy in its broadest sense. In all the countries which I have visited there is a demand that the government be brought nearer to the people; in China a constitution is under consideration; in Japan the people are demanding that the ministry instead of being chosen by the emperor from among his particular friends shall be selected from parliament and be in harmony with the dominant sentiment; in India there is agitation in favor of a native congress; in Russia the czar has been compelled to rec-

ognize the popular voice in the establishment of a douma, and throughout Europe the movement manifests itself in various forms. In the United States this trend toward democracy has taken the form of a growing demand for the election of United States senators by a direct vote of the people. It would be difficult to overestimate the strategic advantages of this reform, for since every bill must receive the sanction of the senate as well as the house of representatives before it can become a law, no important remedial legislation of a national character is possible until the senate is brought into harmony with the people.

I am within the limits of the truth when I say that the senate has been for years the bulwark of predatory wealth and that it even now contains so many members who owe their election to favor-seeking corporations and are so subservient to their masters as to prevent needed legislation. The popular branch of congress has four times declared in favor of this reform by a two-thirds vote and more than two-thirds of the states have demanded it, and yet the senate arrogantly and impudently blocks the way. [*From Madison Square Garden, New York, speech, August 30, 1906.*]

ANARCHY

Ever since that terrible act which took from us our chief executive there has been much discussion of anarchy, and many remedies have been suggested, but

they have all been in the line of suppression. I want to suppress the manifestations of anarchy, but I am not willing to stop with suppression. I do not want us to make the mistake that they have made in the old countries. In those countries in which they have simply employed suppressive measures, they have the most anarchists today. We must go further, and remove the spirit of anarchy. There is no place in the United States for the spirit of anarchy. But how is this spirit to be removed? Not by suppression only—for this is but temporary. If we are to have a permanent remedy, we must find it in education. We must teach the people that a government is necessary, for it is. We must teach them that our government is the best government on earth, for it is; but that is not enough. It is the duty of everyone to exert himself to the uttermost to make this government so good that every citizen will be willing to die, if need be, to preserve the blessings of this government to his children and to his children's children.

The funeral oration of Pericles is probably, with the exception of the oration of Demosthenes on the Crown, the most famous oration that has come down to us from the Greeks, and the most impressive part of this oration presents as a reason for Greek patriotism the beneficence of the government of that country. After describing the greatness of his country, and the excellence of his government, he said: "It was for such a country then, that those men, resolved not to have it taken from them, died fighting, and we, their survivors, may well be willing to suffer in its behalf."

The remedy for anarchy is to make the government deserve the love of every citizen. They are doing most to cure the spirit of anarchy who are doing most to make the government perfect in all its parts; they are doing most to cultivate and spread the spirit of anarchy who pervert the aims of the government, rob the many for the benefit of the few, and then curse the people who do not like to be robbed.

A government can be a great blessing or a great curse. When a government takes from the citizen the power to redress his own wrongs, it assumes the solemn duty of protecting him from every arm uplifted for his injury. If a government first disarms a citizen and then leaves him to be despoiled by those who act under the favoritism of the government, the victim of the wrong, brooding over his injuries, will be likely to listen to the voice of the anarchist. [*From a lecture entitled "A Conquering Nation."*]

PATRIOTISM

Patriotism is a virtue which must be displayed in peace as well as in war, and may be defined as that love of country which leads the citizen to give to his country that which his country needs at the time his country needs it. In time of war the citizen may be called upon to die for his country; in time of peace he must live for his country. In time of war he may be called upon to give his body as a sacrifice; in time of

peace his country demands his head and his heart, his intellect and his conscience. You have shown that you were willing to lay down your lives in order to purchase liberty, now you will be called upon to exhibit self-restraint and moral courage in dealing with the problems of government.

It is written that he that ruleth his own spirit is greater than he that taketh a city. It is too much to expect that all things will be done as anyone would like to have them done or that everyone will receive the reward of which he and his friends may think him deserving; and in hours of disappointment it is well to remember that a person can show more patriotism by suffering for a great cause than by enjoying great rewards.

Let me borrow a story which has been used to illustrate the position of the United States: A man wended his way through the streets of a great city. Unmindful of the merchandise exposed on every hand, he sought out a store where birds were kept for sale. Purchasing bird after bird he opened the cages and allowed the feathered songsters to fly away. When asked why he thus squandered his money, he replied, "I was once a captive myself and I find pleasure in setting even a bird at liberty."

The United States once went through the struggle from which you have just emerged; the American people once by the aid of a friendly power won a victory similar to that which you are now celebrating and our people find gratification in helping to open the door that barred your way to the exercise of your political rights.

I have come to witness the lowering of our flag and the raising of the flag of the Cuban republic; but the event will bring no humiliation to the people of my country, for it is better that the stars and stripes should be indelibly impressed upon your hearts than that they should float above your heads. [*Address delivered at the banquet given by the Cuban Veterans to Governor General Wood and his staff, May 16, 1902.*]

PEACE

I will not disguise the fact that I consider this resolution a long step in the direction of peace, nor will I disguise the fact that I am here because I want this Interparliamentary Union to take just as long a step as possible in the direction of universal peace. We meet in a famous hall, and looking down upon us from these walls are pictures that illustrate not only the glory that is to be won in war, but the horrors that follow war. There is a picture of one of the great figures in English history, (pointing to the fresco by Maclise of the death of Nelson). Lord Nelson is represented as dying, and around him are the mangled forms of others. I understand that war brings out certain virtues. I am aware that it gives opportunity for the display of great patriotism; I am aware that the example of men who give their lives for their country is inspiring; but I venture to say there is as much inspiration in a noble life as there is in a heroic death, and I trust that one of the results

of this Interparliamentary Union will be to emphasize the doctrine that a life devoted to the public, and ever flowing, like a spring, with good, exerts an influence upon the human race and upon the destiny of the world as great as any death in war. And if you will permit me to mention one whose career I watched with interest and whose name I revere, I will say that, in my humble judgment, the sixty-four years of spotless public service of William Ewart Gladstone will, in years to come, be regarded as rich an ornament to the history of this nation as the life of any man who poured out his blood upon a battlefield.

All movements in the interest of peace have back of them the idea of brotherhood. If peace is to come in this world, it will come because people more and more clearly recognize the indissoluble tie that binds each human being to every other. If we are to build permanent peace it must be on the foundation of the brotherhood of men. A poet has described how in the civil war that divided our country into two hostile camps a generation ago—in one battle a soldier in one line thrust his bayonet through a soldier in the opposing line, and how, when he stooped to draw it out, he recognized in the face of the fallen one the face of his brother. And then the poet describes the feeling of horror that overwhelmed the survivor when he realized that he had taken the life of one who was the child of the same parents and the companion of his boyhood. It was a pathetic story, but is it too much to hope that as years go by we will begin to understand that the whole human race is but a larger family?

It is not too much to hope that as years go by human sympathy will expand until this feeling of unity will not be confined to the members of a family or to the members of a clan or of a community or state but shall be world-wide. It is not too much to hope that we, in this assembly, possibly by this resolution, may hasten the day when we shall feel so appalled at the thought of the taking of any human life that we shall strive to raise all questions to a level where the settlement will be by reason and not by force. [*Speech before the Interparliamentary Union at London, July 26, 1906.*]

At the conclusion of Mr. Bryan's speech the amended resolution was unanimously adopted. It reads as follows:

“If a disagreement should arise between the contracting parties which is not one to be submitted to arbitration, they shall not resort to any act of hostility before they, separately or jointly, invite, as the case may necessitate, the formation of an international commission of inquiry or the mediation of one or more friendly powers. This requisition will take place, if necessary, according to Article VIII. of The Hague convention for the peaceful settlement of international conflicts.”

THE PRESIDENCY

Congressman Clayton has introduced the following resolution: “Resolved, That the country is to be congratulated upon the recent declaration of the president

of the United States affirming the wisdom of the custom which limits the president to two terms, which declaration demonstrates that he, in common with all other patriotic Americans, recognizes that the precedent established by Washington and other presidents of the United States in retiring from the presidential office after their second term has become, by universal concurrence, a part of our republican system of government, and that any departure from this time-honored custom would be unwise, unpatriotic and fraught with peril to our free institutions."

This resolution was introduced on December 12, 1907; three days before, Mr. Clayton had introduced a resolution expressing it as the opinion of the house that the precedent established by Washington and other presidents in retiring after a second term had by universal concurrence become a part of our republican system of government, and that "any departure from this time-honored custom would be unwise, unpatriotic and fraught with peril to our free institutions." Between the 9th and the 12th, the president issued his statement announcing that he would adhere to the statement issued by him the night of the election to the effect that he would not be a candidate for another term.

Mr. Clayton's second resolution ought to be adopted by the house. The change in form makes it congratulatory rather than a warning to the president, but it is well that the house should go on record as opposing any departure from the precedent established in regard to the third term. While the resolution is not neces-

sary in the president's case, it may have a salutary influence upon future presidents in case any of them are urged by their admirers to consider a third term.

It is fortunate that the position of congress can be expressed in a resolution applauding the president's determination rather than in a resolution that could be construed as a threat.

Two terms are enough for any president. There should be no third term under any circumstances. In fact, one term is enough and there are more people in this country who favor a one-term presidency than there are who would favor a third-term presidency. The enormous power in the hands of the president presents a temptation so great that the president himself should be protected against it. A man called upon to discharge the responsible duties of chief executive should not be in a position to use the authority which he has for the gratification of a personal ambition. It is the summit of human aspiration—so far as one aspires to political position—and when one reaches this summit he should free himself from every taint of selfishness or ambition and consecrate his official term to a patriotic endeavor to justify the confidence of his countrymen and to win the approval of those who conferred upon him this greatest of all distinctions which mortals can confer upon a fellow being. [*From editorial in The Commoner.*]

I am in favor of an amendment to the constitution making the president ineligible to re-election in order

that he may not be tempted by ambition to use the enormous patronage at his disposal to secure a continuance in office. [*From letter written August 5, 1894, consenting to become a candidate for the United States senate.*]

PRESIDENTIAL NOMINATION.

Mr. Bryan will not ask for or seek a nomination; and he will not assume to decide the question of his availability. He has been so amply recompensed by his party for what he has done and for what he has endeavored to do that he cannot claim a nomination as a reward; neither should his ambition be considered, for he has had honors enough from his party to satisfy any reasonable ambition. The only question that ought to weigh with the party is whether the party can be strengthened and aided more by his nomination than by the nomination of someone else. If he can serve the party by being its candidate, he will accept the commission and make the best fight he can. If, however, the choice falls upon another, he will not be disappointed or disgruntled. His availability is a question to be decided not by him, not by a few leaders, not even by the leading newspapers that call themselves democratic, but by the voters of the party, and to them he intrusts the decision of the question—they are the supreme court in all matters concerning candidates, as they are in all matters concerning the platform.

He assumes that they will not select him unless they desire to make an aggressive fight for the application

of democratic principles to present conditions, and he also takes it for granted that the organization of the party will be in harmony with the platform and will be composed of men whose political records will invite confidence and give assurance that a victory, if won, will not be a barren victory.

No man can ask for a nomination as a compliment if his nomination will not benefit the party, and no democrat would be justified in refusing a nomination if his party demanded his services, and if the members of the party believe that Mr. Bryan's nomination will help the party, its principles and its policies, he will accept the nomination whether the indications point to defeat or victory. A defeat can bring no disgrace where the cause is a just one, but cowardice would be disgraceful, especially in one who is as deeply indebted to his party as Mr. Bryan is.

The next campaign will be an appeal to the public conscience. The investigations have shown not only the corrupt use of large campaign funds, but the only source from which they can be drawn, namely—the corporations that seek to convert the government into a business asset. The democratic party stands for the doctrine of equal rights to all and special privileges to none, and therefore cannot promise favors to favor-seeking corporations. If it made such promises to the corporations, it would be guilty of duplicity, for it would have to betray the voters, as the republican party has done, in order to reward these corporations as the republican party has rewarded them. The democratic campaign must be carried on by

volunteers who will work because they desire the triumph of democratic ideas. We cannot hope to appeal to the sordid or to buy the purchasable, even if such a course would contribute toward democratic success. No one should favor Mr. Bryan's nomination unless the party is willing to open its books and show where its contributions come from and for what the money is expended. The republican party ought to be challenged to conduct its campaign in this open and honest way and if the republican leaders refuse to accept the challenge, the democrats can well afford to leave the issue with the public. An appeal to conscience is politically expedient, as well as morally right, for the conscience is the most potent force with which man deals. The national conscience has already been aroused, and a large majority of the voters have been educated to the necessity for real reform—a reform that will make this government again a government of the people, by the people and for the people. It only remains for the democratic party to convince the voters that it can be entrusted with the work of reform, and nothing will do more to convince the public than a refusal to negotiate with predatory wealth and an honest appeal by honest methods to the honest sentiment of the country. [*From editorial in The Commoner, November 15, 1907, entitled "Mr. Bryan's position."*]

THE VICE-PRESIDENCY

It has been intimated that Vice-President-Elect

Roosevelt is desirous of receiving more consideration at the hands of the President than has, as a rule, been given to those occupying his position. Whether or not the report is true is not material, but the ambition, if he does entertain it, is an entirely worthy one.

Why has the Vice-President been so generally ignored by the Chief Executive in the past? It is said that Mr. Breckenridge was only consulted once by President Buchanan, and then only in regard to the phraseology of a Thanksgiving Proclamation. This incident was related to a later Vice-President who was noted for his skill at repartee, and he replied, with a twinkle in his eye: "Well, there is one more Thanksgiving Day before my term expires."

According to the constitution the Vice-President succeeds to the office in case the President dies, resigns, is removed, or becomes unable to discharge the duties of the office. The public good requires that he should be thoroughly informed as to the details of the administration and ready to take up the work of the Executive at a moment's notice. The Vice-President ought to be ex-officio a member of the President's cabinet; he ought to sit next to the President in the council chamber. Receiving his nomination from a national convention and his commission from the people, he is able to furnish the highest possible proof that he enjoys public respect and confidence, and the President should avail himself of the wisdom and discretion of such an adviser. While the responsibility for action rests upon the occupant of the White House,

he is entitled to, and of course desires, all the light possible before deciding on any question.

Congress can by law impose upon the Vice-President the duty of giving such assistance to his chief, or the President can of his own volition establish the precedent, and it would, in all probability, be observed by his successors.

Many public men have avoided the second place on the ticket for fear it would relegate them to obscurity; some of Colonel Roosevelt's friends objected to his nomination on that ground. A Cabinet position has generally been considered more desirable than the Vice-Presidency, but the latter in dignity and importance is, in fact, only second to the Presidency, and the occupant deserves the prominence and prestige which would come from more intimate official association with the Executive. [*From an editorial in The Commoner.*]

FOREIGN RELATIONS

ENTANGLING ALLIANCES

The reasons given by Washington, Jefferson, and the other statesmen of the early days in support of the doctrine that we should maintain friendly relations with all nations, but enter into entangling alliances with none, are even stronger today than they were a hundred years ago. Our commerce is rapidly increasing, and we are brought into constant communication with all parts of the world. Even if we desired to do

so, we could not afford to alienate many nations by cultivating unnecessary intimacy with a few. Our strength and standing are such that it is less necessary than ever before to lean for aid upon the friendliness of a foreign power.

We cannot connect ourselves with European nations and share in their jealousies and ambitions without losing the peculiar advantage which our location, our character and our institutions give us in the world's affairs. [*Letter of acceptance of 1900.*]

MONROE DOCTRINE

The doctrine enunciated by Monroe, and approved by succeeding Presidents, is essential to the welfare of the United States. The continents of North and South America are dedicated to the development of free government. One Republic after another has been established, until today monarchical idea has barely a foothold in the new world.

While it is not the policy of this country to interfere where amicable relations exist between European countries and their dependencies in America, our people would look with disfavor upon any attempt on the part of European governments to maintain an unwilling or forcible sovereignty over the people living on this side of the Atlantic. [*Letter of acceptance, 1900.*]

COLLECTING DEBTS WITH NAVY

I venture to suggest that we may not only promote peace but also advance our commercial interests by announcing as a national policy that our navy will not

be used for the collection of private debts. While protecting the lives of our citizens everywhere and guaranteeing personal safety to all who owe allegiance to our flag, we should, in my judgment, announce that persons engaging in business and holding property in other lands for business purposes must be subject to the laws of the countries in which they engage in business enterprises. Many profitable fields of investment are now closed because the people of the smaller nations are afraid that an investment of foreign capital will be made an excuse for a foreign invasion. Several times on this trip this fact has been brought to my attention and I am convinced that for every dollar we could secure to American investors by an attempt to put the government back of their private claims we would lose many dollars by closing the door to investment. Mark the distinction between the protection of the lives of our citizens and the use of the navy to guarantee a profit on investments. We do not imprison for debt in the United States, neither do we put men to death because of their failure to pay what they owe, and our moral prestige as well as our commercial interests will be conserved by assuring all nations that American investments depend for protection upon the laws of the country to which the investors go. [*From Madison Square Garden, New York, speech, August 30, 1906.*]

IN THE PHILIPPINES

I have not felt that in these islands I should enter on

any disputed questions. Some things I can say with propriety. While you appreciate the manner in which I have attempted to show my friendship for the Filipinos, do not make the mistake of believing that those who differ from me are not interested in this people. In my country there are two great political parties, republicans and democrats. They enter into contests which are strenuous, but in fundamental principles both are the same. Thomas Jefferson founded the democratic party. Abraham Lincoln was the first great republican. Lincoln has left records to show the admiration he felt for the principles and utterances of Thomas Jefferson.

In two contests I was defeated by the republicans but I believe as much in the patriotism of those who voted against me as I do in the patriotism of those who fought for me. Those who agreed with me announced a policy for the Philippines. Those who opposed me did not. But do not make the mistake of believing that those others are enemies to the islands. I believe the majority of all American people without regard to politics or party are sincere well-wishers of the Filipinos. Yes, all.

However you may differ about policies, all your people speak well of what our country stands for in regard to education. The fact that our people are encouraging education among you ought to be accepted as proof that they intend to act justly toward you. If they intended to do injustice they would not educate you, for the more educated you are the more quickly you will detect and denounce injustice. Let me remind

you that these little children who are attending school speak more eloquently in your behalf than I am able to do. The more educated people you have among you the easier will be the task for those who speak for you in the United States. The more respect your people show for the law the easier will be the task for those who speak for you. The higher the ideals shown in your language and your lives the easier the task of those who speak for you. I want you to have as much confidence in the republicans in power as I have, though I have been twice defeated by them. And when I say this I am not trying to pay them for anything. I do not owe them anything. When I say trust them, I say it because I believe the American people want to do right, and, given the time, will find out what is right on every question.

Differences of opinion must be expected. In fact, that people differ in opinion is to their credit rather than to their discredit. Those who agree in everything do not as a rule think on anything. Differences of opinion must not only be expected but must be respected. Do not expect our people to administer authority here without mistakes. They make mistakes at home, and if we democrats come into power, good as we are, we will make mistakes. The Spanish made mistakes here, and so would the Filipinos. I suggest that if you want to help us in the United States who are interested in you, you can do it by supporting with all the enthusiasm you have the efforts made by America here. Let us hope that whoever is in authority

here and there, they will have the wisdom to so promote the welfare of all as to unite both peoples in an eternal affection. [*Address to Filipinos at Malolos, December 28, 1905.*]

SWOLLEN FORTUNES

The phrase "swollen fortunes" is a happy one for "swollen" means something unnatural or abnormal, and suggests disease. No objection is raised to natural fortunes; normal wealth is healthy and wholesome. There is every reason to encourage the amassing of money by legitimate means; those who grow rich in honest ways are to be commended rather than censured, but it is high time that it should be known that there are unearned fortunes, for until the fact of their existence is known no inquiry will be made into the source of such fortunes; and until the source is known no remedy can be applied.

In order to distinguish the swollen fortunes from the natural ones we must adopt some rule or standard. How may a man honestly accumulate a fortune? By giving to society a service commensurate with the reward which he draws from society. It is not possible to define with mathematical accuracy just how much a man's services are worth, for there is no tribunal which is vested with power to weigh the facts and determine the question. And if the question were submitted to any human tribunal it is not at all cer-

tain that the decision would be in accord with justice, for often the greatest services are not appreciated at the time. By common consent it has been left to society at large to determine what a man shall receive for his work, and competition is the word which we use to describe the method by which the value is fixed. As long as competition is left free each person receives from society the price which society fixes upon his work, as compared with the work of others.

This rule, that each should draw from society in proportion as he contributes to the welfare of society, is in harmony with the divine law of rewards, in so far as that law can be gathered from nature. When God gave us the earth with its fertile soil, the sunshine with its warmth and the showers with their moisture, He proclaimed as clearly as if His voice had thundered from the clouds, "Go work, and in proportion to your industry and your intelligence, so shall be your reward."

The earth yields her treasures to those who labor, and she rewards intelligent labor more liberally than ignorant labor. Two men, living side by side, may cultivate farms of equal area and fertility, and yet one grows rich while the other grows poor. If they are equally intelligent the more industrious one will surpass the less industrious; if they are equally industrious the more intelligent one will forge ahead. Industry and intelligence are both necessary; either is fruitless without the other. (We are not speaking now of economy in the expenditure of the income, or of the use made of the money earned; we shall refer to this later.) Other

things being equal, the farmer who puts the most intelligence into his work will secure the best results. He will examine the soil, so as to plant the crops to which the soil is suited; he will be careful to select the best seed, so as to secure the maximum yield; he will investigate the different kinds of cultivation and ascertain the best time for planting; he will use the implements which will make each hour's work accomplish most. That he is entitled to the rewards that naturally follow his work is universally recognized; and, we may add, no one has ever traced a swollen fortune to a farm. From the beginning of history no one has actually made out of the soil by his own unaided efforts, a fortune large enough to be, in itself, a menace to his country. A man might make money enough in some other way to buy up the land of a community or of a state, and, through a system of landlordism, he might sap the life out of the producers of wealth, but he could not begin by the cultivation of the lands—as large a piece as he could himself cultivate—and out of the land accumulate enough to make himself dangerous to his fellows. [*From an editorial in The Commoner.*]

INCOME TAX

Congress should have authority to levy and collect an income tax whenever necessary, and an amendment to the federal constitution specifically conferring such authority ought to be supported by even those who may

think the tax unnecessary at this time. In the hour of danger the government can draft the citizen; it ought to be able to draft the pocketbook as well. Unless money is more precious than blood, we cannot afford to give greater protection to the incomes of the rich than to the lives of the poor. [*Letter of acceptance, 1900.*]

The income tax, which some in our country have denounced as a socialistic attack upon wealth, has, I am pleased to report, the endorsement of the most conservative countries in the old world. It is a permanent part of the fiscal system of most of the countries of Europe and in many places it is a graded tax, the rate being highest upon the largest incomes. England has long depended upon the income tax for a considerable part of her revenues and the English commission is now investigating the proposition to change from a uniform to a graded tax.

I have been absent too long to speak with any authority on the public sentiment in this country at this time, but I am so convinced of the justice of the income tax that I feel sure that the people will sooner or later demand an amendment to the constitution which will specifically authorize an income tax and thus make it possible for the burdens of the federal government to be apportioned among the people in proportion to their ability to bear them. It is little short of a disgrace to our country that while it is able to command the lives of its citizens in time of war, it

can not, even in the most extreme emergency, compel wealth to bear its share of the expenses of the government which protects it. [*From Madison Square Garden, New York, speech, August 30, 1906.*]

CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTIONS

Mr. Roosevelt's suggestion that the government appropriate money for the legitimate expenses of political parties is original and is entitled to serious consideration. The appropriation might be justified on the same ground that we defend the printing of ballots in payment of primary expenses by the government. A few years ago we had to raise money by subscription to print our ballots; now they are printed at the expense of the public.

In some places the cost of the primaries is still borne by the candidates, while in other places it is paid by the county, city or state. The public is interested in having a campaign so conducted that the issues shall be presented clearly and voters fully informed. There is no doubt that the republican party has been able to secure enormous campaign funds by selling legislation in advance to special interests. If the government should appropriate a reasonable amount for campaign expenses and then apportion that appropriation between the parties according to the vote cast at the last general election, it would enable all parties to present their policies and thus insure more intelligent action on the part of voters.

The president's recommendation ought to be taken up and discussed in all sections of the country. It ought to be, as we have no doubt it will be, ultimately enacted into law. If to this is added a provision forbidding private contributions, the law will go far toward the elimination of corruption in politics, for when the government furnishes the necessary funds it will require a strict accounting of the money spent.

In an article printed several months ago in the Reader Magazine Mr. Bryan said:

"It is not sufficient to prevent contributions from corporations, for where there is a great temptation to aid in campaigns, the officers will find ways of contributing that will not bring the corporation within the letter of the law. It is necessary that the contributions of individuals shall be made public where those contributions are to any considerable amount, and it is also necessary that the publication shall be made in advance of the election in order that the voter may know what influences are at work in the campaign. One of the Washington correspondents has reported the president as considering a law which will provide all the parties with necessary campaign funds to be paid out of the public treasury. I do not know whether this statement is authoritative, but it is a suggestion worthy of consideration. If each party were furnished with a moderate campaign fund in proportion to the votes which it cast at the preceding election, and then all other contributions were prohibited by law, corruption in politics might be reduced to a minimum. And why should not the reasonable and

necessary expenses of a campaign be paid by the public, if the campaign is carried on in the interest of the public? At present, in any controversy between predatory wealth and the masses of the people, the corporations which are seeking special privileges and favors are able to furnish enormous campaign funds to the party subservient to them, and no one can doubt that these campaign funds are furnished upon an understanding, expressed or implied, that they shall be allowed to reimburse themselves out of the pockets of the people." [*From an editorial in The Commoner.*]

In the discussion of laws respecting campaign contributions, one point is often overlooked, namely, that the publication of receipts and expenditures should precede, not follow, the election. The efforts thus far made to secure publicity have been largely nullified by the fact that the publication comes too late. The facts brought out after the election, not being connected with the next campaign, are of little service in that campaign. The fear of a post-election publication will, of course, deter some from corrupt contributions, but a publication before election would still more powerfully deter. The public has a right to know not only who contributes and how much but the information ought to be given before the people vote. Nothing will so tend to prevent the employment of a large corruption fund as the publication of the fund before the election, for the party that

relies upon the trusts to finance its campaign will find that the support of the trust magnates will do the party more harm than the contributions will do it good. Let the facts be known before the election. [*From an editorial in The Commoner.*]

The investigations which have been in progress during the past year have disclosed the business methods of those who a few years ago resented any inspection of their schemes and hid their rascality under high-sounding phrases. These investigations have also disclosed the source of enormous campaign funds which have been used to debauch elections and corrupt the ballot. The people see now what they should have seen before, namely, that no party can exterminate the trusts so long as it owes its political success to campaign contributions secured from the trusts. The great corporations do not contribute their money to any party except for immunity expressly promised or clearly implied. The president has recommended legislation on this subject, but so far his party has failed to respond.

No important advance can be made until this corrupting influence is eliminated and I hope that the democratic party will not only challenge the republican party to bring forward effective legislation on this subject, but will set an example by refusing to receive campaign contributions from corporations and by opening the books so that every contributor of any considerable sum may be known to the public before

the election. The great majority of corporations are engaged in legitimate business and have nothing to fear from hostile legislation and they should not be permitted to use the money of the stockholders to advance the political opinions of the officers of the corporations. Contributions should be individual, not corporate, and no party can afford to receive contributions even from individuals when the acceptance of those contributions secretly pledge the party to a course which it can not openly avow. In other words, politics should be honest, and I mistake political conditions in America if they do not presage improvement in the conduct of campaigns. [*From Madison Square Garden, New York, speech, August 30, 1906.*]

GAMBLING—GREAT AND SMALL

GAMBLING ON FUTURES

There seems to be no doubt that Wall Street speculation is the cause of the present financial panic, and this speculation is made possible by the fact that a large amount of fictitious and watered stock is issued. The small bankers throughout the country claim that their institutions are perfectly solvent, that their assets are good and that their only embarrassment is that they can not collect the money which they have deposited in eastern banks in the reserve cities. In suspending payments the bankers have done what they think is necessary for the protection of them-

selves and their depositors, and it is not fair to criticise them unless one has a better knowledge of the situation than they have; but somebody is to blame, and from the evidence at hand it would seem that the blame rests, first—with the speculators of New York who, in their desire to make money rapidly, have disregarded the interests of the rest of the country; second—with the New York banks and trust companies which have loaned money for speculation; and third, with the republican party whose leaders have linked our whole financial system to Wall Street so that the people throughout the country are forced to suffer for the sins of the masters of high finance. It requires an object lesson to make people consider remedial legislation; abuses are never remedied until there is suffering, and the present panic ought to result in legislation which will give to the public a needed protection. Gambling is one of the curses of the present day—not merely the small gambling which is carried on in back alleys and obscure places, but the gambling which goes on in the chambers of commerce, the boards of trade and the stock exchanges. Purchases and sales of commodities and stocks when the sellers have nothing to sell and the purchasers have no intention of receiving the goods—this may be called business, but it is nothing more nor less than gambling, and in some respects it is worse than gambling at the card table. First, it is on a larger scale than the gambling in the houses known as gambling houses; and second, the men who gamble on the markets sometimes control the markets and thus take an unfair

advantage of those who enter into the game with them. It is time to stop gambling and one of the best ways to stop it is to stop the issue of watered stock and fictitious capitalization, for these are the cards with which the big gamblers play. A corporation whose stock rests upon actual value does not furnish much of an opportunity for exploitation. What the gambler wants is a stock whose value is uncertain, because then the market price can be juggled with. Just as a farm, whose value is to a certain extent fixed, does not furnish the same opportunity to the speculator as the mine whose value is undetermined, so the railroad stock that rests upon a value to be found in the road itself is not subject to fluctuation like the stock of a road whose dividends depend upon the ability of the manager to monopolize business.

We ought to have legislation that will put our railroads and other industrial enterprises upon an honest basis, and then we ought to have legislation forbidding the use of national bank deposits to aid gambling. If the New York banks are to be allowed to receive deposits from country banks, such New York banks ought in all fairness be forbidden to use country deposits to support speculative enterprises. All speculation is risky—if there were no risk in the matter, there would be no speculation about it, and the small banks of the country have a right to insist that their solvency shall not be jeopardized by the use of their deposits for gambling purposes. And if the bankers themselves do not insist upon this, their depositors

ought to insist upon it, for while the local banker may be excused for refusing to honor checks in the present stringency, his depositors can not be blamed if they denounce a system whereby the local bankers are driven into the net spread by New York financiers. [*From an editorial in The Commoner.*]

THE GAMBLING VICE

Of all the vices that afflict the race it is doubtful if any vice is more demoralizing than the vice of gambling for it impoverishes the mind and the morals as well as the purse. A press dispatch tells of a raid recently made on a New York poolroom in which some twenty women were found among the patrons. They are described as "well dressed," "most of them married," "one a white-haired grandmother" and one "the wife of a millionaire." It happens to be women this time, but the papers are full of such items in which men are the principals. Until a few years ago lotteries were chartered in some of the states and permitted to use the mails, and it is but a few months since the guessing contest was prohibited. Even now lotteries are licensed in some European nations and in some of the republics of South and Central America. Missouri has just put an end to licensed betting on horse racing and Ohio did the same thing a year earlier. The stock exchanges are still permitted to rob the unwary but recent investigations are awakening the public conscience and these exchanges will sooner or later be compelled to purge themselves of their speculative features.

The evil of gambling, in whatever form it may appear, is that it cultivates a desire to get something for nothing and substitutes the law of chance for God's law of "reward earned by service." Some bad habits affect only the body, at least in their beginning, but gambling immediately attacks the will and undermines the character. It is a heart disease and paralyzes one's energy. The man who becomes addicted to this vice soon ceases to be a producer because he can not content himself with the slow returns of legitimate effort; then he neglects those dependent upon him and wastes that which he has already accumulated. By this time he is ready to go a step further and use trust funds and cheat those whom he entices into a game. Sometimes the cheating is done with loaded dice or marked cards; sometimes by shells and slight of hand; sometimes it is done on a larger scale by grain corners, wash-sales or by the manipulation of stocks. After swindling comes disgrace and often suicide. Nothing but a higher ideal will prevent one's falling into the habit and nothing but moral regeneration will restore one who has fallen into the habit. No malady is so difficult to cure as one that attacks the will. Parents ought to warn their children against gambling; ministers ought to warn their congregations against it, and newspapers ought to point out its evils to their readers. Only when one is willing to give to society a dollar's worth of service for a dollar's worth of pay and is as careful to give good measure as he is to demand good measure is he on solid ground. An honest purpose begets honest methods and the two

give peace of mind and the best assurance of success in every walk of life. [*Commoner editorial in 1905.*]

STOCK EXCHANGE GAMBLING

It is not necessary to add that grain gambling and stock gambling lead to embezzlements and business failures whereby many lose; it is not necessary to enumerate other demoralizing effects of market speculation. It is not necessary to call attention to the fact that in most cases ruin finally comes upon the speculator as well as upon those whom he dupes and deceives. It is sufficient to say that the men who engage in such speculation not only make no contribution to the welfare of society but constantly sacrifice the interests of innocent people to their own greed. Those who seek by legislation to put the board of trade and the stock exchange upon an honest basis and to make them contribute to the security of business and to the welfare of the country, are the friends of property, not the enemies of property. Such legislation would be beneficial to the farmers who produce, to the consumers for whom the farmer produces and to the middlemen, and hurtful only to those whom selfishness has made blind to the rights of others as well as their own highest good. [*From an article published in the Saturday Evening Post in 1905.*]

CHINESE EXCLUSION

If every American could visit China, the question of Chinese immigration would soon be settled upon a

permanent basis, for no one can become acquainted with the Chinese coolie without recognizing the impossibility of opening the doors of our country to him without injustice to our own laboring men, demoralization to our social ideas, injury to China's reputation among us and danger to our diplomatic relations with that country.

It would require generations to bring our people down to a plane upon which they could compete with the Chinese, and this would involve a large impairment in the efficiency of their work.

It is not just to the laboring men of the United States that they should be compelled to labor upon the basis of Chinese coolie labor or stand idle and allow their places to be filled by an alien race with no thought of permanent identification with our country. The American laborer not only produces the wealth of our nation in time of peace, but he is its sure defender in time of war. Who will say that his welfare and the welfare of his family shall be subordinated to the interests of those who abide with us but for a time, who, while with us, are exempt from draft or military burden, and who, on their return, drain our country of its currency? A foreign landlord system is almost universally recognized as a curse to a nation, because the rent money is sent out of the country; Chinese immigration on a large scale would give us the evil effects of foreign landlordism in addition to its other objectionable features.

A sentimental argument is sometimes advanced to the effect that we have no moral right to exclude any

who seek to come among us. Whether this argument has any force depends, first, on the purpose of the immigrant, and second, upon our power to assimilate. If his coming is purely commercial and he has no ambition to improve us by his coming or to profit morally and intellectually by contact with us, he cannot demand admission upon moral or sentimental ground. And even if his paramount reason for coming were a desire to learn of us, it would still be necessary to consider how far we could go in helping him without injury to ourselves. While visiting the sick is most meritorious, one who gave all his time to such work, leaving no time for sleep, would soon be a physical wreck; feeding the hungry is most commendable, but one who gave away all of his substance, reserving nothing for his own nourishment, could not long serve his fellows. In like manner, our own power to help the world by the absorption of surplus population has certain natural and necessary limitations. We have a mission to fulfill and we cannot excuse ourselves if we cripple our energies in a mistaken effort to carry a burden heavier than our strength can support.

It is better to be frank and candid with the Chinese government. There are twenty times as many Chinese in America as there are Americans in China, and we give to China as much in trade advantage as we receive from her, not to speak of the money which Americans voluntarily contribute to extend education and religion in the Celestial empire. China has no reason to complain, for we have been generous in dealing with her. We can still be not only just, but

generous, but it would be neither kindness to her nor fairness to our own people to invite an immigration of such a character as to menace our own producers of wealth, endanger our social system and disturb the cordial friendship and good will between America and China. [*From letter on China.*]

The Chinese exclusion act has proven an advantage to the country, and its continuance and strict enforcement, as well as its extension to other similar races, are imperatively necessary. The Asiatic is so essentially different from the American that he cannot be assimilated with our population, and is, therefore, not desirable as a permanent citizen. His presence as a temporary laborer, preserving his national identity, and maintaining a foreign scale of wages and living, must ever prove an injustice to American producers, as well as a perpetual source of irritation. [*Letter of acceptance, 1900.*]

AMERICAN IN FOREIGN MISSIONS

That our missionaries often make mistakes need not be denied. They are human, and to err is the lot of all. A missionary among strangers must exercise more sagacity and discretion than one who works among people of his own race. The wonder is not that missionaries make mistakes, but that they do not make more than are now charged to them. It is even possi-

ble that a missionary occasionally proves untrue to his calling—is it strange that this should happen to a missionary almost alone and with but little sympathetic support, when it sometimes happens to ministers who are surrounded by friends and hedged in so that a fall would seem almost impossible?

One part of the missionary's work has received scant notice, namely—the planting of western ideas in the Orient. The daily life of a missionary is not only a constant sermon, but to a certain extent, an exposition of western ways. His manner of dress and his manner of living are noted, and even if he did not say a word, he would make an impression upon those about him. It would be worth while to send Christians to the Orient merely to show the fullness and richness of a Christian life, for, after all, the example of an upright person, living a life of service according to the Christian ideal, is more eloquent than any sermon—it is the unanswerable argument in favor of our religion.

It is sometimes suggested by those unfriendly to missionary work that missionaries live in too great comfort. This criticism will not have weight with those who have attempted to live in the Orient upon the salary of a missionary, but even if the missionaries lived more luxuriously than they do, that would still exert a beneficial influence. As the Chinaman becomes educated he learns of the manners and customs of the people of other nations, and the home of the missionary gives an opportunity for comparisons. In China there is polygamy, while the missionary has but one wife. In the Chinese home the birth of a son is the occasion

for rejoicing; the birth of a daughter an occasion for less rejoicing, if not actual mourning. In the missionary's home the girl is as welcome as the boy. The missionary's wife is not only a standing rebuke to the practice of foot-binding, but is a stimulus to the movement now setting in for the education of women.

The Catholic missionaries reach a class which might not be reached by Protestant missionaries, and Protestant missionaries appeal to some who could not be reached by the Catholic missionaries. Each church does its own work in its own way, and the result is better than if either church attempted to follow the example of the other. The celibacy of the priest and his voluntary sacrifice of home and its joys that he may more fully devote himself to religion—these appeal to some, especially to those who have been impressed with the asceticism of the religious teachers of the Orient. There are others, however, who are more impressed with a form of Christianity which does not deny to its ministers the advantages of the family. In other words, the different branches of the Christian church, each pursuing its own way, meet the widely different needs of the heathen better than any one church could do it.

Why spend money on foreign missions? If the oriental is happy in his idolatry or in his worship of God through other religious forms, why disturb him? These questions may be answered in various ways, but one answer will suffice for the purpose of this article. The Christian ideal of life is the highest ideal. There is no more beautiful conception of life than that it is an overflowing spring. There is no true measure of greatness

except the Christian measure, namely—service. If this ideal is good enough for America, it is good enough for all the world. If truth must, according to eternal laws, triumph, then this ideal must triumph over all lower ones, and how can it triumph over lower ideals unless it is brought into contact with them? If we see a man engaged in some useful work, but laboring with antiquated tools, it is a kindness to him to offer him an implement that will increase his effectiveness. If we see a man following a low ideal and making but little of life, is it not a kindness to offer him a higher one which will not only enlarge his usefulness but his happiness as well? If the Christian ideal is worthy to be followed in America, it is worthy to be presented in every land, and experience has shown that it is an ideal capable of being made universal, for it has commended itself to people of every clime and of every tongue.

But it is said that we must not neglect home missions in our zeal to carry the gospel and its attendant blessings to foreign shores. This is a familiar objection, but as a rule it is urged by those who do the least for home missions. I think I am far within the truth when I say that the most liberal contributors to foreign missions are also the most liberal contributors to home missions and that those who are so afraid that work at home will be sacrificed for work abroad are the very ones who themselves make few sacrifices for the work at home. The same spirit which leads one to be generous in the support of those benevolences which are immediately about him leads him to take an interest in the needy wherever they are found. The same spirit

which makes one anxious to have the Sermon on the Mount known in his neighborhood leads him to desire that the knowledge of this sermon and the philosophy which it contains shall be brought to the people of all the world.

There is another answer to those who say that we must confine our efforts to the home field until we have supplied every moral need. If any individual refuses to assist in the improvement of others until he has himself reached perfection, who will be able to aid others? In the effort to help others one often finds more improvement than could come from concentration of his efforts on himself. So the country which refuses to extend a helping hand to other lands until all its people have passed beyond the need of improvement will do nothing for the world. As the contributions to benevolences would be small indeed, if only those contributed who could do so without sacrifice, so the contributions to the world's advancement would be but slight if only those helped others who were not themselves in need of help.

"Let him who would be the chiefest among you be the servant of all:" if this is the measure of national greatness, then our nation is the greatest of all, for its contributions to the world surpass the contributions made by any other nation. These contributions are made in three ways: First, it contributes through the men and women who have come from other lands to study here, and who carry American ideas back to their homes; second, through the men and women who have

gone to other lands as preachers and teachers; and third, through books and printed reports.

Making due allowance for the frailty of human nature and for the mistakes which all are liable to make, it may be said without fear of successful contradiction that the missionaries, physicians and teachers, who consecrate themselves to the advancement of Asia's millions along Christian lines are as high minded, as heroic, as self-sacrificing, and, considering the great destiny of the race, as useful as any equal number of men and women to be found in any other part of the world. [*From letter on American Foreign Missions.*]

THE REAL DEFENDERS OF PROPERTY

Whenever any vested wrong is to be righted or any long-standing abuse corrected, those who profit by the wrong or the abuse are prompt to pose as the defenders of property and to charge the reformers with attacking property rights. This is the historic attitude of those who oppose remedial legislation. The insincerity of the position taken is usually shown by the arguments employed by these self-styled champions of property, and one of the best illustrations of these arguments is to be found in the story of Demetrius, the silversmith. It reads as follows:

“And the same time there arose no small stir about that way. For a certain man named Demetrius, a silversmith, which made silver shrines for Diana, brought

no small gain unto the craftsmen; whom he called together with the workmen of like occupation, and said, 'Sirs, ye know that by this craft we have our wealth. Moreover, ye see and hear, that not alone at Ephesus but almost throughout all Asia, this Paul hath persuaded and turned away much people, saying that they be no gods, which are made with hands. So that not only this our craft is in danger to be set at naught; but also that the temple of the great goddess Diana should be despised and her magnificence should be destroyed, whom all Asia and the world worshippeth.' And when they heard these sayings, they were full of wrath saying, 'Great is Diana of the Ephesians.' "

The silversmith was profiting by the worship of idols; the making of images was the source of his income. He called together those who were engaged in the same occupation and when all were convinced that Paul's preaching would bring them financial injury they joined in a protest, but they did not give their real reason for opposing Christianity—namely, that it would cause them a money loss, but they pretended a fervent devotion to the goddess Diana. So, today, the beneficiaries of bad laws and bad governmental systems are defending their pecuniary interests with arguments that imply great devotion to the public welfare. Having satisfied themselves that the reforms demanded by the people will lessen their power to extort from, and to tyrannize over, the people, these monopolists and their defenders shout "Great is property! Great are the rights of property!" While the issue between the man and the dollar seems to be an acute one, yet in the

last analysis there can be no issue between human rights and property rights, for nothing more surely undermines property rights than a disregard for human rights, and nothing brings greater security to property than a scrupulous regard for the natural rights of each human being. But we must always remember that human rights are paramount. In fact, everything depends upon the establishment of the true relation between the individual and dull, inanimate property.

The house and its foundation are indissolubly connected, and we can not think of one without the other. So human rights and property rights are indissolubly connected. We cannot think of the one without the other and as, in the building of a house, we must think of the foundation first and of the house as a superstructure, so in thinking of society we must necessarily think of human rights first and of property rights as resting upon human rights. He who talks of property rights as if they could exist without a regard for human rights, speaks as foolishly as one who would attempt to build a house without considering the foundation upon which it is to stand. [*From an article published in the Saturday Evening Post in 1905.*]

AMERICA'S MISSION

Much has been said of late about Anglo-Saxon civilization. Far be it from me to detract from the service rendered to the world by the sturdy race whose lan-

guage we speak. The union of the Angle and the Saxon formed a new and valuable type, but the process of race evolution was not completed when the Angle and the Saxon met. A still later type has appeared which is superior to any which has existed heretofore; and with this new type will come a higher civilization than any which has preceded it. Great has been the Greek, the Latin, the Slav, the Celt, the Teuton and the Anglo-Saxon, but greater than any of these is the American, in whom are blended the virtues of them all.

Civil and religious liberty, universal education and the right to participate, directly or through representatives chosen by himself in all the affairs of government—these give to the American citizen an opportunity and an inspiration which can be found nowhere else.

Standing upon the vantage ground already gained, the American people can aspire to a grander destiny than has opened before any other race.

Anglo-Saxon civilization has taught the individual to protect his own rights; American civilization will teach him to respect the rights of others.

Anglo-Saxon civilization has taught the individual to take care of himself; American civilization, proclaiming the equality of all before the law, will teach him that his own highest good requires the observance of the commandment: "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself."

Anglo-Saxon civilization has, by force of arms, applied the art of government to other races for the benefit of Anglo-Saxons; American civilization will, by the

influence of example, excite in other races a desire for self-government and a determination to secure it.

Anglo-Saxon civilization has carried its flag to every clime and defended it with forts and garrisons; American civilization will imprint its flag upon the hearts of all who long for freedom.

To American civilization, all hail!

“Time’s noblest offspring is the last!”

[*Extract from speech delivered at Washington Day banquet given by the Virginia Democratic Association at Washington, D. C., February 22, 1899.*]

CONSCIENCE

Sometimes when we see the war spirit rampant, we are tempted to say with the poet,

“Right forever on the scaffold,
Wrong forever on the throne.”

But in such hours we can draw inspiration and encouragement from Holy Writ. When Elijah was fleeing from the wrath of wicked Jezebel and believed all the prophets to have been slain, the Lord commanded him to stand upon the mountain, and as he stood there, a mighty wind swept by him and rent rocks asunder, but God was not in the wind; and after the wind came an earthquake, but God was not in the earthquake; and after the earthquake a fire, but God was not in the

fire; and after the fire, a still, small voice, and it was the voice of God. And so, today, throughout the world an increasing number standing upon the heights, are coming to believe that God is not in the ironclads that sweep the ocean with their guns, that God is not in the armies that shake the earth with their tread, or in the fire of musketry, but in the still, small voice of justice that issues from tribunals like that instituted at The Hague. There have been times when bravery upon the battlefield was considered the highest form of virtue. There have been times when intellectual supremacy and intellectual independence were considered all-sufficient, but the time is coming when heart characteristics will receive the attention that they deserve; the time is coming when we shall not define civilization as Buckle defined it, "as measured by the mastery of the human mind over the forces of nature," but shall define it as the harmonious development of the human race, physically, mentally and morally. The time is coming when physical perfection alone will not satisfy, when intellectual training alone will not be sufficient, but when the spiritual man will be considered and his welfare guarded. I believe that we are to build this permanent peace, this permanent arbitration, not upon a plutocracy of wealth or upon an aristocracy of learning, but upon the democracy of the heart. We shall then arraign every evil at the bar of the public conscience, for the most potent force of which man has personal knowledge is the conscience. That conscience can be awakened, and when awakened, its gentle promptings are more imperative

than statute laws, and the invisible barriers which it builds around us are stronger than prison walls. [*From an address delivered before the Holland Society, New York City, January, 1904.*]

There is no resisting the conscience when it is once aroused. To satisfy its demands many have faced death without a fear; in obedience to its promptings, and aglow with an all-pervading love, others have traversed oceans, buried themselves among strangers, and devoted their lives to the elevation of men and women to whom they were bound only by the primary tie which links each human being to every other.

The conscience, quickened, has substituted altruism for selfishness as the controlling purpose of an individual life, and so changed that life that instead of resembling a receptive, stagnant pool it has become like an overflowing spring. As the conscience of an individual may transform him from a fiend incarnate into a ministering angel, so the conscience of a community, a state, or a nation contains dynamic force sufficient to destroy any threatened evil and to propagate any needed truth.

There is evidence today of the awakening of both the individual and the civic conscience. In some places this has taken the form of a religious revival where the regeneration of the hearts of a multitude of people has manifested itself in changed lives, changed customs, and changed social conditions. The recent revival in Wales is an illustration of the far-reaching effect of a

spiritual awakening. In the United States there have been recent indications of a return from materialism and commercialism to a higher spiritual life, and there is going on a world-wide study of the teachings of Christ as they apply to every-day life. [*From an article written for "Public Opinion" in May, 1905.*]

INDIVIDUALISM VS. SOCIALISM

The individualist believes that competition is not only a helpful but a necessary force in society, to be guarded and protected; the socialist regards competition as a hurtful force, to be entirely exterminated. It is not necessary to consider those who consciously take either side for reasons purely selfish; it is sufficient to know that on both sides there are those who with great earnestness and sincerity present their theories, convinced of their correctness and sure of the necessity for their application to human society.

As socialism is the newer doctrine the socialist is often greeted with epithet and denunciation rather than with argument, but as usual it does not deter him. Martyrdom never kills a cause, as all history political as well as religious demonstrates.

In comparing individualism with socialism it is only fair to consider individualism when made as good as human wisdom can make it and then measure it with socialism at its best. It is a common fault of the advocate to present his system, idealized, in contrast

with his opponent's system at its worst, and it must be confessed that neither individualist nor socialist has been entirely free from this fault. In dealing with any subject we must consider man as he is, or as he may reasonably be expected to become under the operation of the system proposed, and it is much safer to consider him as he is than to expect a radical change in his nature. Taking man as we find him, he needs, as individualists believe, the spur of competition. Even the socialists admit the advantage of rivalry within certain limits, but they would substitute altruistic for selfish motives. Just here the individualist and the socialist find themselves in antagonism. The former believes that altruism is a spiritual quality which defies governmental definition while the socialist believes that altruism will take the place of selfishness under an enforced collectivism.

Ruskin's statement that "government and co-operation are in all things eternally the laws of life; anarchy and competition eternally and in all things, the laws of death," is often quoted by socialists, but, like generalizations are apt to be, it is more comprehensive than clear. There is a marked distinction between voluntary co-operation, upon terms mutually satisfactory, and compulsory co-operation upon terms agreeable to a majority. Many of the attempts to establish voluntary co-operation have failed because of disagreement as to the distribution of the common property or income, and those which have succeeded best have usually rested upon a religious rather than upon an economic basis.

In any attempt to apply the teachings of Christ to an economic state it must be remembered that His religion begins with a regeneration of the human heart and with an ideal of life which makes service the measure of greatness. Tolstoy, who repudiates socialism as a substantial reform, contends that the bringing of the individual into harmony with God is the all-important thing and that this accomplished all injustice will disappear.

It is much easier to conceive of a voluntary association between persons desiring to work together according to the Christian ideal, than to conceive of the successful operation of a system, enforced by law, wherein altruism is the controlling principle. The attempt to unite church and state has never been helpful to either government or religion and it is not at all certain that human nature can yet be trusted to use the instrumentalities of government to enforce religious ideas. The persecutions which have made civilization blush have been attempts to compel conformity to religious beliefs sincerely held and zealously promulgated.

The government, whether it leans toward individualism or toward socialism, must be administered by human beings and its administration will reflect the weaknesses and imperfections of those who control it. Bancroft declares that the expression of the universal conscience in history is the nearest approach to the voice of God and he is right in paying this tribute to the wisdom of the masses, and yet we can not overlook the fact that this universal conscience must find

governmental expression through frail human beings who yield to the temptation to serve their own interests at the expense of their fellows. Will socialism purge the individual of selfishness or bring a nearer approach to justice?

Justice requires that each individual shall receive from society a reward proportionate to his contribution to society; can the state, acting through officials, make this apportionment better than it can be made by competition? At present, official favors are not distributed strictly according to merit either in republics or in monarchies; is it certain that socialism would ensure a fairer division of rewards? If the government operates all the factories, all the farms and all the stores, there must be superintendents as well as workmen; there must be different kinds of employment, some more pleasant, some less pleasant; is it likely that any set of men can distribute the work or fix the compensation to the satisfaction of all, or even to the satisfaction of a majority of the people? When the government employs comparatively few of the people it must make the terms and conditions inviting enough to draw the persons needed from private employment and if those employed in the public service become dissatisfied they can return to outside occupations; but what will be the result if there is no private employment? What outlet will there be for discontent if the government owns and operates all the means of production and distribution?

Under individualism a man's reward is determined in the open market and where competition is free he

can hope to sell his services for what they are worth. Will his chance for reward be as good when he must do the work prescribed for him on the terms fixed by those who are in control of the government?

At present, private monopoly is putting upon individualism an undeserved odium and it behooves the individualist to address himself energetically to this problem in order that the advantages of competition may be restored to industry. And the duty of immediate action is made more imperative by the fact that the socialist is inclined to support the monopoly, in the belief that it will be easier to induce the government to take over an industry after it has passed into the hands of a few men. The trust magnates and the socialists unite in declaring monopoly to be an economic development, the former hoping to retain the fruits of monopoly in private hands, the latter expecting the ultimate appropriation of the benefits of monopoly by the government. The individualist, on the contrary, contends that the consolidation of industries ceases to be an economic advantage when competition is eliminated, and he believes, further, that no economic advantage which could come from the monopolization of all the industries in the hands of the government could compensate for the stifling of individual initiative and independence. And the individualists who thus believe stand for a morality and for a system of ethics which they are willing to measure against the ethics and morality of socialism. [*From article published in April, 1906, number of Century Magazine.*]

SOCIALISM

Landlordism, the curse of Europe, is an innocent institution in comparison with the trust carried to its logical conclusion. The man who argues that there is an economic advantage in private monopoly is aiding socialism. The socialist, asserting the economic superiority of the monopoly, insists that its benefits shall accrue to the whole people, and his conclusion can not be denied if his assumption is admitted. The democratic party, if I understand its position, denies the economic as well as the political advantage of private monopoly and promises to oppose it wherever it manifests itself. It offers as an alternative competition where competition is possible and public monopoly wherever circumstances are such as to prevent competition.

Socialism presents a consistent theory, but a theory which, in my judgment, does not take human nature into account. Its strength is in its attack upon evils the existence of which is confessed; its weakness is that it would substitute a new disease—if not a worse one—for the disease from which we suffer. The socialist is honest in the belief that he has found a remedy for human ills, and he must be answered with argument, not with abuse. The best way to oppose socialism is to remedy the abuses which have grown up under individualism but which are not a necessary part of individualism, and the sooner the remedy is applied the better.

As I was leaving home I set forth my reasons for

opposing the socialistic doctrine that the government should own and operate all the means of production and transportation; my observations during the past year have strengthened my conviction on that subject. Because I am anxious to preserve individualism, I am earnest in my desire to see the trusts exterminated, root and branch, that the door of opportunity may be open to every American citizen. [*From Madison Square Garden, New York, speech, August 30, 1906.*]

THE PARAMOUNT ISSUE

There is an issue more fundamental than either the trust issue, or the tariff issue, or the railroad issue and it is involved in all of these issues, and this larger and more fundamental issue is this: Shall the government be administered by the people in the interest of the whole people, or shall it be administered for the benefit of a few and by those whom the few, through coercion and the corruption of politics, elevate to power. Shall the people rule, is an issue which all people can understand. Shall this be a people's government or a government of syndicates, by syndicates and for syndicates? This is a question that demands attention. The trusts have made the government a government of a few, and for a few, just as the beneficiaries of the tariff have subordinated the welfare of eighty millions of people to the pecuniary interests of a comparative few who are engaged in protected industries.

The railroad magnates have, in like manner, been permitted to prey upon the stockholders as well as the patrons of the road. On every subject that has come before congress, the republican leaders have taken the side of the classes against the masses until at last the public is aroused and the people ready to act.

The paramount issue, therefore, is the protection of all of the people who desire equal rights from the few who demand special privileges, and this issue is presented in every question which is before the public or is likely to come before the public. The few are interested in centralization; the many demand the preservation of the rights of the citizens. The few are interested in providing monopolies; the many demand the restoration of competition for the protection of the public. The few profit by a high tariff; the many demand that taxation shall be for purposes of revenue and not for the enrichment of a secondary class. The few grow rich by the issue of watered stock and fictitious capitalization and by the juggling of the values of railroads; the many demand that the railroads shall be conducted as quasi-public enterprises with due regard to the interests of the stockholder and the patron. The few would make the wage earner the bond-servants of corporate masses; the many insist upon reasonable hours and reasonable compensation for those who toil and for trial by jury as well as impartial investigation of dispute between labor and capital. The few hope to coin money out of a colonial policy; the many—from principle, as well as because they pay the taxes and furnish the sons for the army—demand the recognition of the

American doctrine of self-government wherever the American flag floats. The few may accumulate enormous fortunes by the equipping of large armies and the building of large navies and the opening of a life service to a comparatively small part; the many prefer peace and honest friendship with all nations and the justice in government that will make force unnecessary.

It is favoritism for a part of the people or justice to the whole population, and no matter where you turn this issue presents itself. It is paramount because it is uppermost in the minds of the people and paramount also because it is embodied in all of the questions under consideration.

On this issue the democratic party must stand with the people and fight for the people. If between now and election time it can convince the public that it is worthy to be trusted by the people it will become the instrument of the people to secure the reforms, the need of which is now confessed, but the accomplishment of which cannot be expected from republican leadership. [*From an editorial in The Commoner.*]

THE LAW OF REWARDS

I know of no more imperative need today than that there should be a clear recognition of the law of rewards, namely, that each person is entitled to draw from society in proportion as he contributes to the welfare of society. This law is fundamental. It conforms to that

sense of justice which forms the broad basis of social intercourse and a firm foundation for government. This sense of justice is offended when any one, either through the favoritism of government or in defiance of government, acquires that for which he has not given an equivalent. There are certain apparent exceptions, but they will upon examination be found to be only apparent or to present evidence of an attempted approximation to the standard. For instance, by general consent there is acquirement by right of discovery. A man finds something of which man has not before known, and although the discovery may not have caused him great effort yet it may be of great value. There is justice in giving him a reasonable compensation out of the thing which he has discovered, but the fact that the government, under whose jurisdiction the land lies, limits by metes and bounds the land which the pioneer may claim, is evidence of an effort to fix a relation between service and compensation. And so if one discovers precious metals the law determines the amount of land that can be claimed under the discovery. The inventor, also, in return for the benefits conferred upon society, is given a temporary monopoly of the sale of the thing invented, but the fact that he is protected for a limited time only is another proof of the general desire that the reward collected from society shall be proportioned to the benefit conferred upon society. It is hardly necessary to add that in the case of an invention the attempt is often a crude one, the inventor in many cases losing in large part or entirely the protection intended for him, while some one pre-

pared to furnish money for experimentation receives the lion's share of the benefits.

The inheritance would seem to furnish the most notable exception to the rule of rewards and yet it cannot really be considered an exception, for a man's right to provide for those dependent upon him is as sacred as his right to provide for himself, and the mutual obligations between parent and child take inheritances out of the ordinary rules of property, and yet even in this case the graded taxes now imposed upon inheritances in various states—and they should be imposed in all states—indicate a tendency to limit the testamentary disposition of property. Gifts are either, first, an expression of affection or friendship, or, second, payment for service rendered or payment in advance for service to be rendered to the donor or to others.

But turning from the exceptions to the rule, what could be more salutary today than a universal recognition of this law of rewards? If instead of measuring success by the amount received, each one measured success by the amount actually earned, what a transformation would be wrought in the world! If each one were so perfectly under self-control and so attached to a high ideal as not to desire more from the world than a just reward for his contribution to the world's welfare, society would present a changed appearance. Nearly all injustice, nearly all of "man's inhumanity to man," can be traced to an attempt on the part of the wrong-doer to obtain something for nothing or something for which only part payment is offered. A conscientious application of this law of rewards would not

only go far toward adjusting disputes between labor and capital, but it would go far toward removing the barriers between the classes. The employe to make a just complaint against his employer shows that the latter is claiming a larger share of the joint profit than is his due, and the employer to bring a just indictment against his employe alleges that the employe is seeking a larger compensation than he has earned. There would be little difficulty in adjusting hours of labor and the conditions of labor if the primary question of participation in profits could be adjusted, and that adjustment cannot be equitably made upon any other basis than that of equivalent values. With universal acquiescence in this rule the usurer would disappear, carrying his train of evils with him; with the establishment of this rule the stock jobber and the market gambler would cease to disturb the law of supply and demand, and the reign of watered stock and of exploitation would be at an end. The observance of this rule would make factory laws unnecessary and relieve from premature toil hundreds of thousands of children who now, to the shame of our civilization and to the permanent harm of our country, become sullen supporters of the family when they should enjoy the delights of childhood and the advantages of school. Those who, instead of trying to see how much they can squeeze out of the world are anxious to give to the world a dollar's worth of service for a dollar's worth of pay, are protected against every form of swindling, for the "get-rich-quick" schemes which spring up and impose upon the public until they are exposed and driven out, always

appeal to the speculative spirit, and lead their victims to expect something for nothing.

It must not be understood, however, that the law of rewards comprehends all of one's obligations. There is a clear distinction between justice and benevolence. Justice requires that each person shall be secure in the enjoyment of that which he earns, but there is something better than justice. True, the elimination of injustice is greatly to be desired, but if the world contained nothing more comforting there might still be a vast amount of suffering and woe. After the government has exhausted human wisdom in the effort to so adjust rewards as to secure to each person a fair and just compensation for all that he does, religion steps in and suggests a still higher and broader rule. Justice would leave the individual to suffer for his own errors and to pay the penalty for his own mistakes, but love as taught in the Bible and exemplified by the Author of our religion, teaches us to "feel another's woe" and to bear one another's burdens. If sickness overtakes a neighbor it does not satisfy the conscience to say: "He brought it upon himself, let him suffer." If a wife is impoverished by the dissipations of a husband it does not satisfy the conscience to say: "She ought to have known better than to marry him," or "She ought to leave him." If a child is left friendless it does not satisfy the conscience to say: "It is not my child; I owe it nothing." In a multitude of ways we are daily brought face to face with the fact that this world needs something more helpful, more encouraging, more uplifting than justice, and love supplies this need. A high

ideal of life, therefore, leads us to be more exacting with ourselves than we are with others. We must use a larger measure when we estimate society's claims upon us than when we calculate our claims upon society, for while we have a right to expect from society a fair compensation for what we do, we are in duty bound to make to society a contribution which no legal definition can measure. [*Address entitled "Man," delivered at Commencement Day exercises, Nebraska State University, June 15, 1905.*]

BEFORE THE IRISH CLUB

I have some Irish blood in my veins. (Applause.) Just how much I do not know. I hope it will not be necessary to investigate, for I think I claim more than I could prove. (Laughter.) I have the testimony of my father that we were of Irish extraction, although we don't know when our ancestors landed in America, or from what part of Ireland they came. I know that I am part Irish; my name helps me out in that. I am part English. My father's mother's name helps me out in that. I am part Scotch. My mother's mother's name helps me out in that. (Laughter.) But I am all American. (Applause.) I think my wife not only has some of the blood of each of these countries, but as she goes beyond me in nearly every other respect, so in this, she traces her ancestry to one more race than I do, and mixes a little

German with Irish, English, and Scotch. (Applause.) So that you can understand we have a double reason for appreciating the cordiality of your welcome. (Applause.) Mention has been made of the fact that some of your countrymen have gone to America. That is true (laughter)—a great many. In fact so many, that when I was in Ireland the other day I could not help noticing the number of American names you have on your buildings. (Laughter and applause.) I saw nearly everywhere names with which I am familiar, on the buildings in Cork, Dublin and Belfast. I may say to you that the Irish who have gone to America have been a great help to our country. I can say without flattery that no people have come amongst us who have shown themselves more capable of efficient participation in every department of American life. (Applause.) You may go into any section of the country, you may go among the people of any occupation, of any profession, of any calling, and you will find the Irish there. (Applause.) There is no department of work in America in which they have not played a conspicuous part. They have been prominent in the ministry, they have been prominent in statesmanship, they have been prominent at the bar, and in every industrial occupation they have borne their part. It is not strange, therefore, that there should be a sympathy between the people of Ireland and the people of the United States. (Applause.) It is not strange, therefore, that everything that affects your welfare interests them, that every aspiration you have for the development and elevation and progress

of your people finds a warm response in the hearts of the American people (applause), and that is true, as has been so eloquently said, without regard to party, and without regard to creed. (Applause.) Just as in Ireland, O'Connell, the Catholic, and Parnell, the Protestant, found common ground in advocating the rights and interests of Irishmen, so in my country Protestants and Catholics look with friendly eyes upon the Emerald Isle, and wish you great prosperity and the advancement of your people. (Applause.) It is true, also, in politics, for while I think I can say that the majority of the Irish in America belong to the party to which I belong, I must be frank enough to tell you that sympathy with the Irish cause is not monopolized by the democratic party. The republican, as well as the democrats, look with interest and deep concern upon all that appertains to your welfare, and your development, and your ambitions. (Loud applause.) I think I owe that to the people of my country, to my political opponents, to say that we, democrats, can not claim any greater love for you, or greater interest in you, than the republicans can, for I believe this feeling is well nigh universal. (Applause.)

If I was speaking merely from the political standpoint I might express regret that your people, when they went to America, divided themselves among the various parties, yet when I find good people in the party opposed to me, instead of discouraging me, it encourages because it gives us much to fight for in getting them out of the other party into our own.

(Laughter.) For if we had all the good people in our party, and all the bad people in the other party, it might be bad for our country.

Mr. O'Connor has mentioned our country and its position in the world. I am glad that the people of Ireland feel as they do towards America, and I may say to you that in an absence of now a little more than ten months, it has done my heart good to find a friendly feeling towards the United States in all the countries I have been in. Nowhere did I find people expressing anything but interest in the United States, and I want to say this to you—that it has strengthened me in the conviction that the ambition of my nation should be not to make people fear it, but to make people love it. (Applause.) If there be any who take pride in the fact that people outside of their land bow in fear before their flag, I take pride in the fact that we have a flag which makes them turn their eyes towards Heaven and thank God there is such a flag. (Applause.) [*From address before the Irish Club in London.*]

State and Nation

THE DUAL SCHEME

The democratic party is pledged to defend the Constitution and enforce the laws of the United States, and it is also pledged to respect and preserve the dual scheme of government instituted by the founders of the Republic. The name, United States, was happily chosen. It combines the idea of national strength with the idea of local self-government, and suggests "an indissoluble union of indestructible states." Our Revolutionary fathers, fearing the tendencies toward centralization, as well as the dangers of disintegration, guarded against both; and national safety, as well as domestic security, is to be found in the careful observance of the limitations which they imposed. It will be noticed that, while the United States guarantees to every state a republican form of government and is empowered to protect each state against invasion, it is not authorized to interfere in the domestic affairs of any state except upon application of the legislature of the state, or upon the application of the Executive when the legislature cannot be convened.

This provision rests upon the sound theory that the people of the state, acting through their legally chosen representatives, are, because of their more intimate

acquaintance with local conditions, better qualified than the president to judge of the necessity for federal assistance. Those who framed our constitution wisely determined to make as broad an application of the principles of local self-government as circumstances would permit, and we cannot dispute the correctness of the position taken by them without expressing a distrust of the people themselves. [*Letter of acceptance in 1896.*]

ADVANTAGES OF THE DUAL SYSTEM

The monopolists who are bleeding the country are the very ones who are constantly defying the states and belittling their rights. Of course they object to national legislation, and in making their objection they naturally present arguments in favor of the state, but these arguments ought not to fool anybody. Whenever the state attempts to do anything these same monopolists rush to the cover offered by the federal courts. The railroads have done more to build up the power of the federal courts than any other one influence, and there is scarcely a state legislature which the railroads have not defied. If the trust magnates and the railroad presidents had their way about it, state lines would be entirely obliterated, and corporations would be chartered by the federal government. That they do not have their way about it is due to the fact that the people recognize the necessity for local self-government. It is true that the states have been brought nearer together and their relations made

more intimate since the adoption of the federal Constitution but the need for the state is stronger today than it was a century ago. The wide extent of our country, the increase in our population, the greater complexity of our business relations and industries—all these increase the importance of the state. The federal government could not look after the multiplied interests of the people. The founders of the Constitution built more wisely than they knew when they reserved to the states the powers not delegated to the federal government. Congress has all the power that it needs. In the realm of interstate commerce it is supreme. The state can charter corporations, and so long as those corporations confine their business to the state, the federal government can not interfere, but the moment those corporations step across the state line, they come under the supervision of the federal government and Congress has power to fix the terms upon which they shall do business. This is a very much better arrangement than to have national corporations superior to and independent of the states. We have trouble enough with overgrown state corporations. We would have still more trouble if we permitted the creation of overgrown national corporations.

The state and the nation—both are necessary—and the doctrine of Jefferson and Jackson is the doctrine that must prevail today. We need no new principles; we need only the courageous application of old-time principles to the new conditions. We need remedies, state and national, but it is not necessary that the na-

tion should encroach upon the rights of the state or the state upon the rights of the nation in order to secure such remedial legislation as is demanded. [*From an editorial in The Commoner.*]

INFLUENCE OF THE STATE

The states are even more needed than they formerly were for the administration of domestic affairs. As a matter of theory, that government is best which is nearest to the people. If there is any soundness at all in the doctrine of self-government, the people can act most intelligently upon matters with which they are most familiar. There are a multitude of things which can be done better by the county than by state authority, and there are a multitude of things which can be done better by the state than by the federal government. An attempt to transfer to the national capital the business now conducted at the state capitals would be open to two objections, either of which would be fatal. First, Congress could not transact the business. The work now devolving on the national legislature makes it difficult to secure consideration for any except the most important measures. The number of bills actually discussed in a deliberate way is small; most of the bills that pass are rushed through by unanimous consent, and a still larger number die on the calendar or in committee.

Second, the members of Congress could not inform themselves about local needs. The interests and industries of the nation are so diversified and the various sections so different in their needs that the members of

Congress from one part of the country would be entirely ignorant of the conditions in other parts of the country. Whenever Congress attempts legislation now for a particular section, the matter is usually left to the members from that section, but more often the matter is crowded out entirely by larger interests.

The farther the legislative body is from the community affected by the law, the easier it is for special interests to control. This has been illustrated in state legislatures when long-time charters have been granted to franchise corporations by the votes of members whose constituents, not being interested, do not hold them to strict account, and it would be worse if Congress acted on the same subjects. [*From an editorial in The Commoner.*]

JEFFERSON'S REASONS

One of Jefferson's reasons for supporting state governments in all their rights was that they were the surest bulwark against anti-republican tendencies. Those anti-republican tendencies exist today, and the bulwark cannot be dispensed with. While popular government is growing stronger all over the world, there are still those in this country who distrust the people. There are many prominent men who regard Hamilton as the greatest of the political thinkers of his day, although his statesmanship cannot be considered independently of the views embodied in his plan of government. There are those who are constantly irritated by the limitations which the Constitution has

placed upon the sphere of the federal government, and who resent the independence of the state in its local affairs. This very irritation ought to be a warning; if there are those who are irritated because they cannot override the wishes of the community, what would be the irritation in the community if the wishes of its members were overridden? A systematic absorption of power by the federal government would not only cause discontent and weaken the attachment of the people for the government, but a withdrawal of power from the state would breed indifference to public affairs—the forerunner of despotism.

The exercise by the federal government of restraining power is not so objectionable as the exercise of creative power, but even in the exercise of restraining power care should be taken to preserve to the states the exercise of concurrent authority, so that the state government, as well as the national government, can stand guard over the rights of the citizen.

The demand for the enlargement of the powers of the federal government comes from two sources, viz., from those who believe with Hamilton in the theory of centralization, and from those who want legislation which the state's rights doctrine obstructs. Of these two classes the last is most influential, because the members of this class impart to their method the strength supplied by the object aimed at. An abstract theory seldom provokes discussion, but wars have been fought over a theory embodied in a concrete issue. [*From an editorial in The Commoner.*]

SPHERE OF THE STATE

The recent decision of the supreme court sustaining the federal judges in North Carolina and Minnesota, focuses public attention upon a subject, consideration of which cannot be much longer delayed: Shall the lower federal courts have jurisdiction to suspend the laws of the various states before the state courts have had an opportunity to pass upon those laws? The newspapers which take their inspiration from the large corporations are congratulating the country that property is made more secure by the decision, and that vested interests are rescued from peril. How long will these papers be able to deceive the public and to mislead their readers? Property is in no danger and vested interests are not imperiled. The laws of the states can be depended upon to protect property rights and vested interests. The question is simply a question of dealing with corporations. Shall the corporation be regarded as superior to the natural man? That is the only question involved. If a natural man locates in a state and engages in business he must rely upon the state courts for his protection. The state protects him in his life, in his liberty and in his property and he resorts to the courts of the state when he seeks to enforce a right. Under the present laws and decisions it is different with the corporation. A railroad corporation can be organized in the state of New Jersey and proceed to engage in business in any of the forty-six states of the union; it gets from the state a license to build a railroad; it uses the power of eminent domain and con-

demns land; the state laws protect its property and the lives of its employes, but when a citizen sues the railroad for more than two thousand dollars, or the state attempts to regulate the railroad, the railroad contemptuously turns its back upon the state and the courts of the state and drags its adversary into the United States court. Why should a state be so impotent when it deals with a corporation which owes so much to the state?

If the state passes a rate law the railroad at once enjoins the enforcement of the law on the ground that it is unconstitutional. While the courts are deciding this question the state stands helpless. The law has not been declared unconstitutional by any court, and yet, the state is not permitted to enforce it. If, after months or years of litigation, the United States court decides that the law is not unconstitutional, then during all of the intervening time the state has been prevented from enforcing a constitutional law. Why not give to the state courts rather than to the railroads the benefit of the presumption? Why clothe a corporation with privileges so much superior to those of the natural man? The democrats of Congress are right in urging the passage of a law withdrawing from the circuit and district courts of the United States power to suspend state laws. Let every corporation doing business in the state submit its controversies to the courts of the state, and thus put itself upon the same footing with domestic corporations and with individual residents. If the state courts deny the corporation justice, the corporation still has its appeal from the high-

est state court to the United States supreme court. Is not this protection enough?

The big corporations and their defenders, conscious of the weakness of their cause, constantly confuse the issue. The question is, not whether property shall be protected, for the state has as much interest as the nation in the protection of property; the question is, shall the corporation be brought down to the level of the God-made man, or shall it be made an object of worship? The democrats are right in insisting that the state shall not be deprived of its power to protect its citizens, and that federal remedies shall be added to state remedies, not substituted for them. There is no disposition anywhere to deny to the federal government its constitutional authority, but the jurisdiction of the district and circuit courts of the United States is regulated by Congress, and Congress ought to withdraw the jurisdiction which the lower federal courts are now using to the prejudice of the states and citizens of the states. [*From an editorial in The Commoner.*]

Capital and Labor

EMPLOYER AND EMPLOYEE

I have referred to the investigation of international controversies under a system which does not bind the parties to accept the findings of the court of inquiry. This plan can be used in disputes between labor and capital; in fact, it was proposed as a means of settling such disputes before it was applied to international controversies. It is as important that we shall have peace at home as that we shall live peaceably with neighboring nations, and peace is possible only when it rests upon justice. In advocating arbitration of differences between large corporate employers and their employes, I believe we are defending the highest interests of the three parties to these disputes, viz.: the employers, the employes and the public. The employe cannot be turned over to the employer to be dealt with as the employer may please.

The question sometimes asked, "Can I not conduct my business to suit myself?" is a plausible one, but when a man in conducting his business attempts to arbitrarily fix the conditions under which hundreds of employes are to live and to determine the future of thousands of human beings, I answer without hesitation that he has no right to conduct his own busi-

ness in such a way as to deprive his employes of the right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. To support this position, I need only refer to the laws regulating the safety of mines, the factory laws fixing the age at which children can be employed, and usury laws establishing the rate of interest. The effort of the employer to settle differences without arbitration has done much to embitter him against those who work for him and to estrange them from him—a condition deplorable from every standpoint.

But if it is unwise to make the employer the sole custodian of the rights and interests of the employes, it is equally unwise to give the employes uncontrolled authority over the rights and interests of the employer. The employes are no more to be trusted to act unselfishly and disinterestedly than the employers. In their zeal to secure a present advantage they may not only do injustice but even forfeit a larger future gain.

The strike, the only weapon of the employe at present, is a two-edged sword and may injure the workmen as much as the employer, and even when wholly successful, is apt to leave a rankling in the bosom of the wage-earner that ought not to be. Society has, moreover, something at stake as well as the employer and employe, for there can be no considerable strike without considerable loss to the public. Society, therefore, is justified in demanding that the differences between capital and labor shall be settled by peaceful means. If a permanent, impartial board is created, to which either party of an industrial dispute may appeal or which can of its motion institute an inquiry,

public opinion may be relied upon to enforce the finding. If there is compulsory submission to investigation, it is not necessary that there shall be compulsory acceptance of the decision, for a full and fair investigation will, in almost every case, bring about a settlement.

No reference to the labor question is complete that does not include some mention of what is known as government by injunction. As the main purpose of the writ is to evade trial by jury, it is really an attack upon the jury system and ought to arouse a unanimous protest. However, as the writ is usually invoked in case of a strike the importance of the subject would be very much reduced by the adoption of a system of arbitration, because arbitration would very much reduce, even if it did not entirely remove, the probability of a strike.

Just another word in regard to the laboring man. The struggle to secure an eight-hour day is an international struggle and it is sure to be settled in favor of the workingmen's contention. The benefits of the labor-saving machine have not been distributed with equity. The producer has enormously multiplied his capacity, but so far the owner of the machine has received too much of the increase and the laborer too little. Those who oppose the eight-hour day do it, I am convinced, more because of ignorance of conditions than because of lack of sympathy with those who toil. The removal of work from the house to the factory has separated the husband from his wife and the father from his children, while the growth of our cities has

put an increasing distance between the home and the workshop. Then, too, more is demanded of the laboring man now than formerly. He is a citizen as well as a laborer, and must have time for the study of public questions if he is to be an intelligent sovereign. To drive him from his bed to his task and from his task to his bed is to deprive the family of his companionship, society of his service and politics of his influence. [*From Madison Square Garden speech, New York, August 30, 1906.*]

ARBITRATION

I desire to give special emphasis to the plank which recommends such legislation as is necessary to secure the arbitration of differences between employers engaged in interstate commerce and their employes. Arbitration is not a new idea—it is simply an extension of the court of justice. The laboring men of the country have expressed a desire for arbitration, and the railroads cannot reasonably object to the decisions rendered by an impartial tribunal. Society has an interest even greater than the interest of employer or employe, and has a right to protect itself by courts of arbitration against the growing inconvenience and embarrassment occasioned by disputes between those who own the great arteries of commerce on the one hand, and the laborers who operate them on the other. [*Letter of acceptance in 1896.*]

No one who has observed the friction which arises between great corporations and their numerous em-

ployes can doubt the wisdom of establishing an impartial court for the just and equitable settlement of disputes. The demand for arbitration ought to be supported as heartily by the public, which suffers inconvenience because of strikes and lockouts, and by the employers themselves as by the employes. The establishment of arbitration will insure friendly relations between labor and capital, and render obsolete the growing practice of calling in the army to settle labor troubles. [*Letter of acceptance, 1900.*]

LABOR AND "PROPERTY RIGHTS"

Every attempt to legislate in the interests of the laboring men is met with the declaration that it is an interference with the rights of property. How would property be created but for labor? And who will say that the man who furnishes the capital should be permitted to decide without appeal the conditions upon which property shall be created by those who labor for him? We often hear it asked by the manufacturer: "Have I not the right to manage my own business?" That is not the question. If the manufacturer will set himself to work to produce something with his own hands, nobody will question his right to control his own business. But something more is implied by his question. If he would put the question fairly he would ask, not "Have I not the right to manage my own business?" but rather, "Have I not the right, in managing my business, to regulate the lives, the liberty, the hopes, the happiness of those whom I

employ?" But to ask the question in this form would be to suggest a negative answer, while he demands an affirmative answer.

Those who claim the right to arbitrarily determine the hours, the wages and the conditions of labor demand the right to arbitrarily determine the status of the laboring man and to fix the conditions that are to surround him and his posterity. Is it an interference with property rights to demand that the laboring man shall have a fair share of the proceeds of his own toil—a fair share of the property which he creates? His right to accumulate property should not be ignored. Not only should he be allowed to accumulate property, but he should have leisure to enable him to enjoy communion with his own family and to fit himself for intelligent participation in the affairs of his government. By what authority will the capitalist put his claim to larger dividends above the rights of the wage-earners and the welfare of the wage-earner's children? [*From an article published in the Saturday Evening Post in 1905.*]

REPRESENTATION IN THE CABINET

I cannot too strongly emphasize the importance of the platform recommendation of the establishment of a department of labor, with a member of the Cabinet at its head. When we remember how important a position the laborer fills in our economic, social and political fabric, it is hard to conceive of a valid objection being made to this recognition of his services.

Agriculture is already represented in the President's official household; the army and navy have their representatives there; the state department, with its consular service, and the treasury department, with its close connection with fiscal affairs, keep the Executive in touch with the business and commercial interests. A Cabinet officer truly representative of the wage-earning class would be of invaluable aid, not only to the toilers but to the President. [*Letter of acceptance, 1900.*]

THEIR SHARE IN PROSPERITY

Of course, the laboring man has shared in the general prosperity brought by better crops, a larger volume of money and higher prices, but he has not shared as fully as he ought to have shared, and for that reason he is not singing praises to the republican party. He knows that the trusts are extorting from him more than he ought to pay for that which he has to buy and that these same trusts are bent upon the destruction of the labor organizations which have benefited the laboring man infinitely more than the republican party has ever tried to benefit him. The laboring men know also that they toiled in vain to secure remedial legislation at the hands of the last republican congress, and these labor leaders were so incensed at their failure that they went into politics more actively than ever before, in the hope of defeating republican leaders who prevented legislation favorable to the laboring men.

The republican party has been in power continu-

ously since 1896. It has controlled the presidency, the senate, the house and the United States court. It has had power to do all that it wanted to do; if it has failed to do that which should have been done, it must be because the party leaders lacked knowledge as to what should have been done or lacked the desire to do what should have been done. The testimony of the labor leaders is unanimous that the republican party has not met the expectations of the wage-earners. [*From an editorial in The Commoner.*]

EDUCATION AND THE LABORING MAN

Education has increased the efficiency of the laborer, and, therefore, his earning power; it has enlarged his capabilities, and, therefore, his independence. The man whose mental discipline is such that he can easily adjust himself to any occupation which offers an opening has a great advantage over one who has nothing but muscle to offer. Those who have dealt with the Oriental laborer comment upon his lack of initiative. He does what he is told to do and does it as he is directed; but if anything happens in the absence of the overseer the laborer is lost for he does not know how to meet an emergency or to devise a new method on the spur of the moment.

Education also enables a man to present with intelligence his claims for proper treatment. In any group of men who have a grievance to state, the men who can state the grievance clearly and forcibly naturally become the leaders, and so an improvement in the

average condition of the man follows closely upon his intellectual improvement.

Education furnishes the companionship of books and tends to raise the standard of social intercourse. No matter how favorable the influences of government or the social environment may be, much depends upon the habits of the individual; and education, by supplying a higher form of enjoyment, lessens the conviviality that wastes time and money as well as impairs the strength. Intelligence and morals are not inseparable companions, but one is apt to promote the other. It would be a reflection on the dispensations of Providence to doubt that the proper development of the body, the mind or the heart would, for any natural reason, retard the development of the others. The thing to be desired is the harmonious development of the threefold man, and the performance of our duty in respect to the care of one part of our being throws light upon our duty in respect to the care of the other parts. [*From an editorial in The Commoner.*]

GOVERNMENT BY INJUNCTION

While what is generally known as government by injunction is at present directed chiefly against the employes of corporations, when there is a disagreement between them and their employer, it involves a principle which concerns everyone. The purpose of the injunction in such cases is to substitute trial by judge for trial by jury, and is a covert blow at the jury system. The abolition of government by injunction

is as necessary for the protection of the reputation of the court, as it is for the security of the citizen. Blackstone, in defending trial by jury, says:

“The impartial administration of justice, which secures both our persons and our properties, is the great end of civil society, but if that be entrusted entirely to the magistracy, a select body of men, and those generally selected by the prince or such as enjoy the highest offices in the State, their decisions, in spite of their natural integrity, will have frequently an involuntary bias toward those of their own rank and dignity. It is not to be expected from human nature that the few should be always attentive to the interests and good of the many.”

If the criminal laws are not sufficient for the protection of property, they can be made more severe, but a citizen charged with crime must have his case tried before a jury of his peers. [*Letter of acceptance, 1900.*]

Should the accused be given the right of trial by jury when the contempt charged is committed outside of the presence of the court? The writ of injunction has been employed a few times against the trusts, but it has been employed out of consideration for the trusts. The trusts themselves have preferred the injunction to the criminal process. The injunction, however, has been employed against the laboring men, not out of consideration for them, but in order to deny to them the right of trial by jury. No one de-

fends the commission of crime by laboring men, but it is not defending a crime to say that one charged with a crime should be entitled to trial by jury. It is not necessary that one should indorse the use of the injunction in labor troubles in order to say that he is a friend of law and order. Law can be preserved and order enforced without surrendering the protection afforded by jury trial, and the claim of the laboring men to this protection is a just claim and one that should have been recognized long ago. [*From an editorial in The Commoner.*]

Guaranteed Banks

THE PLAN OUTLINED

The plan of the guaranteed bank is simply this: Statistics show the average loss to depositors to be very small, taking all the banks together. But the depositors are afraid because they do not know much about the affairs of any particular bank. The postmaster general, in recommending the postal savings banks, called attention to the fact that a large sum of money is sent back to the government banks of Europe by people who are afraid to trust the private banks here and Mr. Wanamaker has been quoted as saying that a large sum is kept in hoarding and hiding places in this country.

If this sum can be drawn into the banks and thus be put into channels of trade it will relieve the stringency more effectively than anything else. The postal bank will do this to a limited extent, but not completely, for in the plan proposed the depositors will be limited as to each person, and there will be no checking account allowed.

The system of the guaranteed banks contemplates the absolute guarantee by the government of such banks as may voluntarily enter into the system. In entering the system they agree to reimburse the government in

proportion to their deposits for any losses incurred by the government in payment of depositors in failed banks. During the last forty years the average loss among national banks has been less than one-tenth of one per cent of deposits, and, as we have passed through two panics in that time, it is not likely that the average loss will be greater during the next forty years.

The government by its guarantee makes the bank deposits equivalent to government bonds, and yet it assumes no real risk because it has the capital, the stock, the surplus and the additional liability of the stockholders of the guaranteed banks as its security. [*From an editorial in The Commoner, December 13, 1907.*]

The only objection that is likely to be made is that state banks might be less attractive to depositors if national banks are guaranteed, but there are two answers to this objection. In the first place, state banks are likely to suffer if this financial stringency continues; and they are therefore interested in restoring confidence. In the second place, there is no reason why state banks should not be protected by a similar system under which the state would guarantee depositors in state banks and collect the expenses from the state banks guaranteed.

Mr. Bryan proposed when in congress the raising of a guarantee fund for the protection of depositors, but the bill was defeated by the larger banks on the ground

that the big banks would have no advantage over the little ones if all depositors were secured, but now that the big banks are suffering as much as the little ones the objection will hardly be made. The plan then proposed would furnish protection as far as the fund would furnish it, but it would take time to raise such a fund, and it is better for the government to make the security absolute by becoming guarantor, for this system can be put into operation at once and that, too, without expense to the government, inasmuch as the banks would reimburse the government from time to time in case the government was called upon to pay the deposits of any failed bank. [*From an editorial in The Commoner, Nov. 29, 1907.*]

“MAKE ALL BANKS EQUALLY GOOD”

Hamilton, O., February 20.—Mr. James B. Forgan, First National Bank, Chicago, Illinois: Dear Sir: Being absent from home, I have not yet received the letter which you addressed to me at Lincoln, Neb., but having read it in the Chicago Record-Herald, I hasten to reply.

The language which I attributed to you, I quoted word for word from one of the Chicago papers. I have no way of ascertaining just now from which paper I quoted it, but that is immaterial, for I am perfectly willing to accept your correction, and to argue the proposition upon the language which you use in your letter.

You were quoted by one of the papers as saying

that the guarantee of deposits "would make all banks safe," whereas what you really said was that it would "make all banks equally good." I accept the correction, although the distinction which you draw is, I think, a very fine one. But desiring to do you full justice, I will hereafter be careful to use your exact language and not trust to paraphrasing even when the paraphrase closely follows your language.

You object to the government's guarantee because it puts all banks on an equality and makes all banks equally good, and you object to it for two reasons: First, because it would deprive banks like your own of the advantage which they have won by "conservatism and good management." You intimate that it is not selfish for you to defend yourself and your bank against a policy that would "despoil" you or it "of vested rights and property," and are willing to admit your selfishness if that can be considered selfish.

Let me make the charge so directly that there can be no question about what I mean. I charge that you put the interests of your stockholders above the interests of your depositors and that you put the interests of the big bank above the interests of the various communities and of the public at large. You admit this when you insist that the guarantee of all banks would deprive your stockholders of a value which has come from wise management.

Let me remind you that that which you regard as "good will" is largely an advantage created by law. The good will which you measure in dollars and cents is not entirely due to good management. It is due,

in the first place, to the fact that you are a National bank, and you are a national bank because the representatives of the people enacted a law that permitted you to organize as a national bank. It is due in part to the fact that national banks are inspected and regulated by law, and these laws are made by the representatives of the people. It is due in part to the fact that many people believe that deposits in national banks are in some way guaranteed by the government as the bank note is. The people who deposit money in your bank do not, as a rule, know anything about the management of the bank. They do not know anything about your methods of doing business. They do not know whether the directors are using the deposits for their own enterprises or carefully guarding them. They do not know any more about the interior workings of your bank than they did about Mr. Walsh's bank or than they knew about other banks that have failed. They take it for granted that your bank is safe because they trust the government and have confidence in the regulation, restriction and inspection of banks. If you had rented a room and announced that James B. Forgan would accept money on deposit and carry on business as a private banker without any regulation or restriction as to the manner of conducting the business, you might have claimed credit for such reputation and standing as you might have been able to acquire. But you did not do that. You associated yourself with a bank whose prestige and reputation depend more upon the law and upon

the presumption given by the people to the law, than upon superior care or management.

When the laws were made, the law makers thought they had provided for the security of depositors, and it is not only unfair in you to count as entirely personal to yourself or your directors, the confidence shown by the public in your bank, but it is selfish to insist that the people have no right to obtain further security, even if, as a result of that, your bank loses some of the advantages which it now has over smaller banks. The bank exists for the benefit of the people. It is a mistake to assume that the people exist for the benefit of the bank. The laws regulating banking are made for the depositors rather than for the stockholders, because the stockholders are able to protect themselves, while the depositors are helpless.

The law requires that a certain percentage of the deposits shall be kept as a reserve—why? For the benefit of depositors. The law provides that not more than ten per cent of the capital and surplus shall be loaned to one person—why? For the protection of depositors. Every law passed for the protection of depositors tends to equalize the banks, and you can make just as sound an argument in favor of the repeal of all restrictions as you can make against the guarantee of deposits. The fundamental difficulty is that you look at the question from the standpoint of the banker and not from the standpoint of the depositor, and you insist that the depositor shall be left unsecured in order that your bank may have an advantage over smaller banks.

What security do you give your depositors that other banks do not give their depositors? Is it that the officers of your bank are better men? They may die, and inferior men take their places. Is it because your directors are better than other directors? The board of directors may change. Is it because your stockholders are better than others? Your stock is sold on the market and a change may take place any day in the ownership of the stock, that will entirely change the character of the bank, and if such change takes place, who will know it? Will not the new directors and the new officers claim to be conservative? When a bank fails, the public finds out for the first time what has been going on behind the counter.

All banks are "conservatively" managed until they fail, and then they take their place among "recklessly" managed banks. As a matter of fact nearly all banks are managed well enough to protect depositors from loss but the trouble is that the depositors have no way of knowing with certainty which are good and which are bad. If the depositors could know just what banks are safe, and what unsafe, they might not need the protection of the law, but they do not know this until too late.

In the recent stringency, the banks all over the country felt themselves justified in suspending payment upon checks, and for the first time in our history the depositor was told how much of his own money he would be allowed to draw out for the carrying on of his business. Why was this extraordinary step necessary? Because the banks throughout the

country had deposited a part of their reserves in New York and other reserve cities, and could not withdraw them. Each bank feared a run if it permitted the withdrawal of deposits, and why would depositors want to withdraw? Because they were afraid of losing their deposits, if they did not withdraw. You will remember that the big banks were not any better than the little ones in that crisis, and as a result of the stringency that followed, immense loss was suffered by men who had deposited money in the banks with the firm belief that they could withdraw the money at will.

I answer your first argument, therefore, by saying, that you overestimate the personal element in the prestige that you enjoy and underestimate the advantage that you derive from the law; and, second, that our laws should be made for the benefit of all the people and not for the benefit of a few of the people. The number of those who deposit in the banks is larger than the number of stockholders, and you must not forget that widows and orphans are depositors in banks as well as purchasers of bank stock. While I can admire the interest which you feel in the widows and orphans who are stockholders, I must remind you that the widows and orphans who deposit money in banks are also entitled to consideration. It is supremely selfish in you to forget the interests of the larger number of depositors who make banking profitable. Banking would not be very advantageous if you only loaned the money of the stockholders. The real profit of banking comes from the loan of de-

positors' money and it is a little heartless in you to look at the question entirely from the standpoint of those who get the benefit of the deposits. The law considers the welfare of those who make the deposits and it is unfortunate that those in charge of the banks do not always take a view of the situation broad enough to include the interests of depositors.

Your second argument is, that the guarantee of deposits would lead to reckless banking and that the business communities would protest against the guarantee system on the ground that it would make all banks insecure and drive the better class of people out of the banking business.

That, of course, is a prophecy, and a prophecy is more difficult to answer than an argument based upon history. In so far as experience teaches anything, it teaches just the contrary. A guarantee law has been passed in Oklahoma, and the result is that the bankers of southern Kansas have joined with the depositors in asking for a special session of the legislature in Kansas to consider a guarantee system, and they have done so because they fear that deposits will be withdrawn from Kansas and carried into Oklahoma. In my home city, a vote was taken in the Commercial club, which is composed of business and professional men, and the vote stood about ten to one in favor of the guaranteed bank. And since you refer to the silver question, I beg to inform you that the men who voted ten to one in favor of the guaranteed bank, voted about three to one against the restoration of bimetallism. Instead of driving men out of the bank-

ing business, the Oklahoma law has led a number of national bankers to take steps toward changing their banks into state banks in order to take advantage of the state law, in case national banks are not allowed to enter the system. If national banks are not permitted to avail themselves of state guarantee systems, the state banks are likely to gain an advantage over the national banks, and the national bankers understand this.

When I tried to secure the passage of a bill in Nebraska, providing a guarantee fund for state banks, it was opposed by the national banks on the ground that people would remove their deposits from the national banks to the state banks, if the state banks were made absolutely secure; and it is to avoid injustice to either class of banks, that I have urged that national banks should be permitted to take advantage of guarantee systems established in the states and that state banks should be permitted to take advantage of any guarantee system established by congress.

The guarantee of deposits will not produce recklessness in management. You are selected by the stockholders, not by the depositors. You will endeavor to manage your bank in the interest of the stockholders, and your argument shows that you consider their interests as paramount. Under a guaranteed system of banks, you would still be responsible to your stockholders. They would lose all that they have and be subjected to the 100 per cent liability in addition, before other banks could lose anything on account of your bank's failure. Would this not be sufficient to

make you careful? And if your regard for your stockholders would make you careful, why would not other bank officials be made careful by their regard for their stockholders? The guarantee of deposits does not relieve the stockholders of responsibility—neither does it relieve the director or the officer of care. The guarantee of deposits simply means that the depositors who have no choice in the selection of officers shall not be held responsible because of mismanagement by officers.

Do you think we could improve the character of our bankers by repealing all laws providing for regulation and inspection? If not, why do you think it would lower the character of bank officials to increase the security of depositors?

Your indictment against banking is more severe than I have ever brought—more severe than is brought by depositors generally. You are not willing to trust other banks to the extent of helping to pay their depositors, although it could be but a small tax upon your bank, and yet you expect depositors to trust the banks, even though the depositors may lose all that they put into the banks. If bankers will not trust each other, they ought not be surprised at some timidity among depositors.

The fact is, that the country is suffering today from lack of confidence in banks more than from any other cause. The money can not be drawn from hiding and hoarding unless the depositors are assured of the safety of the banks. The amount of the tax on each bank would be little compared with the benefit which it would receive from its share of the increased de-

posits, and as for making banks unsafe, the guarantee system will insure safer banking.

Nearly every bank failure is due to the appropriation of the money by the directors or officers. In discussing this question in New York recently, I put the question to ex-Secretary Gage and to Mr. Baker, the president of the National Bank of New York, and they admitted in the presence of a company of some eight hundred that almost all bank failures are traceable to the misconduct of directors. They also admitted that the law ought to make it a criminal offense for a bank official to loan more than one-tenth of the capital or surplus to one person.

Why have we not been able to secure better regulation of banks? The answer is simple. The bad banks don't want any regulation and the good banks prefer to make a business advantage out of the recklessness of other banks. When banks become mutually responsible for each other's depositors, it will be easier to secure the proper regulation of the banks.

The financiers of the country have had their way for a generation, and they have not used their influence to protect depositors. They have failed so completely that the postmaster general has recommended the postal savings bank for the security of savings. Millions of dollars are sent out of this country every year to be deposited in the government banks of Europe because of distrust of our banks, and the guaranteed bank is being advocated as a means of protecting depositors.

Those who preside over the big banks have not been

as interested as they ought to have been in the general public. They have been satisfied to raise their own bank stock to a premium, by pointing out the insecurity of deposits in smaller banks, and they object to having this advantage removed. The big bank has two advantages over the small bank even when the depositors are made secure. In the first place, a big bank can loan more to one person than a small bank can and is thus able to draw the business of the larger merchant. This is an advantage that the big bank will still have. A bank with a capital of a million and a surplus of a million can loan two hundred thousand dollars to one individual, while a bank with a capital of a hundred thousand and a surplus of a hundred thousand, can only loan twenty thousand dollars to one person.

There is also a prestige in the big bank that business men understand. There is a certain vanity to which the big bank appeals. The depositor has the advantage of business acquaintance and business connection with the big bank. He can refer to it when his business standing is asked, and this advantage the big bank will still have. Why should it ask for an advantage based upon the insecurity of all depositors and the insecurity of all communities? Why not "make all banks equally good" so far as the depositor is concerned? Why not protect all widows and all orphans from danger of loss to their deposits? Why not protect all business men from the danger of having payment on their checks suspended? Why not protect all communities from the embarrassment that

follows a bank failure? Why not protect banks from runs and withdrawals based upon timidity and fear? Why not make banks so secure that people will deposit all their money in the banks instead of putting some of it away under carpets? The amount of money that will be drawn from hoarding and hiding by the guarantee of bank deposits will give us a larger circulation than can be secured through frantic calls upon the government for its surplus funds. When the banks were in distress, they did not hesitate to call upon the government for the use of the people's money and that money was loaned to them without interest to the extent of nearly two hundred and fifty million dollars. This money was raised by taxation upon all the people and while the people's money was being loaned to the banks to tide them over a stringency, the people themselves were afraid to deposit their money in the banks and many of them were withdrawing their money from the banks.

It all depends upon the point of view. If legislation is to have for its object the welfare of the whole people, then the guaranteed bank ought to come and come to stay. If, however, legislation is to have for its object the securing of privileges to a few of the community at the expense of the rest of the community, your argument is sound.

I believe that it would be perfectly safe for the federal government to guarantee deposits in the national banks, collecting from all the banks in proportion to deposits the amount that it would have to pay out to the depositors of banks that fail, and I believe that it

would be safe for states to adopt a similar system to guarantee the depositor in state banks. In that case, the government would have back of it the assets of all the banks. Experience shows that the loss has been less than one-tenth of one per cent in the case of national banks during the last forty years, and it ought to be even less than that with the better regulation that would come with a guaranteed system. But if objection is made to an absolute guaranty by the government, the same end can be reached by the system adopted in Oklahoma whereby the banking board collects a guarantee fund and is then empowered to make such further assessments as may be necessary to restore the fund in case money is drawn from it to pay the depositors of a failed bank. This puts all of the banks behind each bank, without involving the government in a direct guarantee.

I thank you for your letter. Your position in the banking world is so prominent that I can assume that you have said all that can be said in opposition to the guaranteed bank, and when you fail so completely to make out a case and show so conclusively that you take a one-sided view of the subject and ignore the welfare of depositors and of the country at large, I need not expect that any stronger arguments will be presented by anyone else. I think your letter will make an excellent campaign document because it shows that the depositors must look out for their own interests and secure legislation for their own protection.

This letter, like yours, is intended for the public as well as for the one to whom it is addressed, and I

shall, therefore, give it to the press without waiting for it to reach you and I shall take pleasure in printing your letter in full in *The Commoner*, that the readers of my paper may have the benefit of your views.

Very truly yours,

W. J. BRYAN.

[*From The Commoner.*]

Money and Banking

WALL STREET AND THE TREASURY

Those who demand the divorcement of the treasury department from Wall street are not the enemies of private property; they simply insist that public property should not be taken for private purposes, and that the functions of government should not become an asset in private business. It ought not to be considered heresy to say that the government should be administered by the people in their own behalf. It ought not to subject one to criticism to declare that the financial system of the government should be made to subserve the interests of the whole people and not be used to advance the interests of a few. Legislation can produce a drouth of money as surely as the sun, when rain is withheld, can produce a drouth in the fields, and scarcity of money is as sure to increase the purchasing power of the dollar as scarcity of a cereal is sure to raise the price per bushel. Those who insist that the dollar should be made as stable as possible in its purchasing power are not the enemies of property; they simply protest against allowing the standard of value to be juggled with in the interest of the money-changer and the holder of fixed investments.

Those who desire to have the taxes limited to the

needs of the government and, when collected, kept in the treasury, are not guilty of doing injustice to the banks. They are simply advocating a system which denies to the banks a valuable and unearned privilege which, when bestowed, arrays the banks against the rest of the people, for if the banks can make a profit out of the government deposits they are pecuniarily interested in keeping the surplus large while the rest of the people are interested in keeping the surplus small.

In like manner it can be shown that those who oppose banks of issue are not open to the criticism that they are attacking property interests, for there is no more reason why a bank should draw interest upon bonds and at the same time have the use of the face value of the bonds in bank notes, than that any other bondholder should keep his money and at the same time draw interest upon it as if loaned to the government, and there is no good reason why this particular form of security should be singled out and made profitable to the holder, while other forms of security, equally good, are discriminated against. [*From an article published in the Saturday Evening Post in 1905.*]

AN ATTRIBUTE OF SOVEREIGNTY

No person or corporation has a natural right to issue money. It is "an attribute of sovereignty," and the banks can no more demand as a right the power to supply a currency for the people than they can demand the right to enact laws for the general govern-

ment of the people. I trust I shall not offend anyone when I say that banks are not eleemosynary or philanthropic institutions. They have their place in society and, when they conduct themselves properly, contribute to the welfare of society just as every good citizen contributes to the welfare of society by his services. The business of loaning and discounting is not necessarily connected with issuing money, and if the banks join to their legitimate business the issue of paper which is to pass as money, we may rest assured that they will do it for the profit there is in it. [*From speech delivered in House of Representatives, June 5, 1894.*]

ASSET CURRENCY

There is such a similarity between the editorials in the city dailies demanding an asset currency as to suggest that the editorials are written in response to a suggestion from the money centers. The big financiers have either brought on the present stringency to compel the government to authorize an asset currency or they have promptly taken advantage of the panic to urge the scheme which they have had in mind for years. Several years ago Secretary Shaw stated that we must either have a perpetual debt or the bank notes would have "some other basis." The "some other basis" referred to is the asset basis. When it became apparent that the public would not tolerate an asset currency, the financiers asked for an emergency currency based on assets. This was only a subterfuge and the republican leaders were afraid to press it at the

last session. Now it is to be brought forward as if it were a new remedy, just thought of as a panic cure. It is a panic breeder instead of a panacea; it would aggravate rather than relieve the situation. It would increase the bank's liabilities just at a time when depositors are fearful that the bank cannot meet present liabilities. The need of elasticity has been very much exaggerated; if banks would prepare in advance for "moving crops" and for such other future demands as may be reasonably expected they would not be confronted by so many "emergencies." The trouble is that they loan to the limit in ordinary times and therefore have no reserve available for the unusual demands. Another trouble is that the banks are encouraged to keep a large part of their reserve in reserve cities and therefore a shock in any of the big cities disturbs banking everywhere. Just now the country banks cannot use their reserves because the big city banks will not allow deposits to be withdrawn.

When the same money is counted over and over in the reserves of several banks, the withdrawal of one thousand dollars results in shrinkage of several times that sum.

The democrats should be on their guard and resist this concerted demand for an asset currency. It would simply increase Wall Street's control over the nation's finances, and that control is tyrannical enough now. Such elasticity as is necessary should be controlled by the government and not by the banks. The government could furnish a certain amount of elasticity by increasing and decreasing government deposits accord-

ing to the needs of business; or it could provide for the temporary issue of treasury notes on government bonds whenever an holder of bonds is willing to surrender the interest; or it could issue treasury notes in any emergency. But none of these plans will suit the financiers; they insist upon absolute control of the nation's finances—they to reap the advantage while the public bears the burden and takes the chances.

But the democrats in the senate and house are in duty bound to look at the question from the standpoint of the people, and oppose the asset currency in whatever form it may appear. They may also have to oppose the great central bank, which is a part of a scheme of the financiers. And they will find that the same influences which are behind the asset currency and the central bank are behind the president's plan for national incorporation of railroads. They are all a part of plutocracy's plan to increase its hold upon the government.

What we need just now is not an emergency currency but greater security for depositors. The depositors are scared—unnecessarily scared in most cases—but scared. The government is going to recommend a postal savings bank but, according to press dispatches, deposits will not be accepted in excess of two hundred and fifty dollars from any one person. This is good as far as it goes, but it does not go far enough. All bank depositors should be made to feel secure, and they could be made to feel secure by a guaranty fund raised by a small tax upon deposits. When depositors feel sure of their money they will not care to withdraw it,

and the money which would be drawn from hiding places would more than repay the banks for the small tax necessary.

The first thing is to release the public from the grip of Wall Street and then, when the stock gamblers have to suffer for their own sins instead of unloading them on the general public, we may expect legislation in the interest of the people at large. [*From an editorial in The Commoner.*]

Imperialism, Militarism and Self-Government

IMPERIALISM

The defenders of imperialism or colonialism have posed as the special champions of commercial interests and of property rights, and so distinguished a representative of the imperialists as Senator Lodge has advocated the holding of the Philippines on the ground that our nation must look after its pecuniary interests. No one who will investigate the subject will doubt that the persons benefited by imperialism are small in number compared with the persons whose property interests are injured by imperialism. Thousands pay taxes to hold the Filipinos in subjection where one person draws a dollar's worth of profit out of our occupation of the islands. The profit realized from trade with the Filipinos amounts to but a small per cent upon the money that we are expending there, and all the people spend the money while but a handful reap the benefits.

The American does not expect to go to the Philippine Islands to live. If all of the Filipinos were killed off, the country would not be colonized by Americans as North America was colonized by Europe. Ahab had a far better excuse for wanting the land of Naboth than we have for wanting the Philippine Islands. Naboth's

land joined the land of Ahab and the taking of it enlarged the land that he cultivated, and yet the Bible tells us that Naboth's right to hold the land was vindicated. Who will vindicate our right to conquer the Filipinos in order to hold land that must be worked through overseers and protected by an alien government and an army? The right of the Filipino to hold his property rests upon the same basis that our right to hold property does, and we cannot ignore his property rights without endangering our own. [*From an article published in the Saturday Evening Post in 1905.*]

While the American people are endeavoring to extend an unsolicited sovereignty over remote peoples, foreign financiers will be able to complete the conquest of our own country. Labor's protest against the black list and government by injunction and its plea for arbitration, shorter hours and a fair share of the wealth which it creates, will be drowned in noisy disputes over new boundary lines and in the clash of conflicting authority.

Monopoly can thrive in security so long as the inquiry, "Who will haul down the flag?" on distant islands turns public attention away from the question, "Who will uproot the trusts at home?"

What will it cost the people to substitute contests over treaties for economic issues? What will it cost the people to postpone consideration of remedial legislation while the ship of state tosses about in the whirlpool of international politics?

English rule in India is bad not because it is English, but because no race has yet appeared sufficiently strong in character to resist the temptations which come with irresponsible power.

We may well turn from the contemplation of an imperial policy and its necessary vices to the words of Jefferson in his first inaugural message: "Sometimes it is said that man cannot be trusted with the government of himself. Can he, then, be trusted with the government of others? Or have we found angels in the form of kings to govern him? Let history answer this question."

The alien may possess greater intelligence and greater strength, but he lacks the sympathy for, and the identification with, the people. We have only to recall the grievances enumerated in the Declaration of Independence to learn how an ocean may dilute justice and how the cry of the oppressed can be silenced by distance. And yet the inhabitants of the colonies were the descendants of Englishmen—blood of their blood and bone of their bone. Shall we be more considerate of subjects farther away from us, and differing from us in color, race and tongue, than the English were of their own offspring?

Modest Jefferson!—he had been Governor, Ambassador to France, Vice-President and President; he was ripe in experience and crowned with honors; but this modern lawgiver, this immortal genius, hesitated to suggest laws for a people with whose habits, customs and methods of thought he was unfamiliar. And yet the imperialists of today, intoxicated by a taste of blood,

are rash enough to enter upon the government of the Filipinos, confident of the nation's ability to compel obedience, even if it cannot earn gratitude or win affection. Plutarch said that men entertained three sentiments concerning the ancient gods: They feared them for their strength, admired them for their wisdom, and loved them for their justice. Jefferson taught the doctrine that governments should win the love of men. What shall be the ambition of our nation, to be loved because it is just or to be feared because it is strong? [*From a newspaper article on Imperialism.*]

Jefferson has been quoted in support of imperialism, but our opponents must distinguish between imperialism and expansion; they must also distinguish between expansion in the western hemisphere and an expansion that involves us in the quarrels of Europe and the Orient. They must still further distinguish between expansion which secures contiguous territory for future settlement, and expansion which secures us alien races for future subjugation.

Jefferson favored the annexation of necessary contiguous territory on the North American continent, but he was opposed to wars of conquest and expressly condemned the acquiring of remote territory. [*Interview at Savannah, Ga., December 13, 1898.*]

While our plans should be unselfish, they would probably prove profitable in the end, for friends are

better customers than enemies, and our trade is apt to develop in proportion as we teach the natives to live as we do. When Solomon came to the throne, instead of choosing riches or long life, he asked for wisdom that he might govern his people aright, and he received not only wisdom, but the riches and the length of days which he had regarded as less important. May we not expect a similar reward if we choose the better part and put the welfare of the natives above our own gain?

After all, the test question is, have we "faith in the wisdom of doing right?" Are we willing to trust the conscience and moral sense of those whom we desire to aid?

Individuals have put Christianity to the test and have convinced themselves that benevolence, unarmed, is mightier than selfishness equipped with sword and mail, but nations have as yet seldom ventured to embody the spirit of the Nazarene in their foreign policy. Is it not an opportune time for our nation to make the trial? Our President has recently been hailed as a peace-maker because he took the initiative in terminating a great war, but this involved no sacrifice upon our part. May we not win a greater victory by proving our disinterested concern for the welfare of a people separated from us not only by vast waters but by race, by language and by color?

Carlyle in concluding his history of the French Revolution declared that thought is stronger than artillery parks and that back of every great thought is love. This is a lofty platform, but not too lofty for the United States of America.

We have more at stake in this matter than have the Filipinos. They still have their national greatness to achieve; our position is already established. We have the greatest republic known to history; we are the foremost champion of the doctrine of self-government and one of the leading exponents of Christianity. We can afford, aye our honor requires us, to be candid with the Filipinos and to take them into our confidence. We dare not make them victims of commercial greed or use their islands for purely selfish purposes. It is high time to announce a purpose that shall be righteous and to carry out that purpose by means that shall be honorable. [*From letter on Philippines.*]

Awake, O ancient Law-Giver, awake! Break forth from thine unmarked sepulchre and speed thee back to cloud-crowned Sinai; commune once more with the God of our fathers and proclaim again the words engraved upon the tables of stone—the law that was, the law that is today—the law that neither individual nor nation can violate with impunity. [*From speech delivered at Chicago, Ill., January 7, 1899.*]

Other nations may dream of wars of conquest and of distant dependencies governed by external force; not so with the United States. The fruits of imperialism, be they bitter or sweet, must be left to the subjects of monarchy. This is the one tree of which the citizens of a republic may not partake. It is the voice of the

serpent, not the voice of God, that bids us eat. [*From a speech delivered in Denver, January 17, 1899.*]

COLONIALISM

Our nation has lost prestige rather than gained it by our experiment in colonialism. We have given the monarchist a chance to ridicule our Declaration of Independence and the scoffer has twitted us with inconsistency. A tour through the Philippine Islands has deepened the conviction that we should lose no time in announcing our purpose to deal with the Filipinos as we dealt with the Cubans. Every consideration, commercial and political, leads to this conclusion. Such ground as we may need for coaling stations or for a naval base will be gladly conceded by the Filipinos, who simply desire an opportunity to work out their own destiny, inspired by our example and aided by our advice. Insofar as our efforts have been directed toward the education of the Filipinos, we have rendered them a distinct service, but in educating them we must recognize that we are making colonialism impossible. If we intended to hold them as subjects we would not dare to educate them. Self-government with ultimate independence must be assumed if we contemplate universal education in the Philippines. [*From Madison Square Garden, New York, speech, August 30, 1906.*]

SELF-GOVERNMENT

Those who question the capacity of the Filipinos for self-government overlook the stimulating influence of

self-government upon the people; they forget that responsibility is an educating influence and that patriotism raises up persons fitted for the work that needs to be done. Those who speak contemptuously of the capacity of the Filipinos, ignore the fact that they were fighting for self-government before the majority of our people knew where the Philippine Islands were. Two years before our war with Spain, Rizal was put to death because of his advocacy of larger liberty for his people, and after witnessing the celebration of the ninth anniversary of his death, I cannot doubt that his martyrdom would be potent to stir the hearts of coming generations whenever any government, foreign or domestic, disregarded the rights of the people. [*From letter on Philippines.*]

LIBERTY

In commemoration of the fact that France was our ally in securing independence, the citizens of that nation joined with the citizens of the United States in placing in New York Harbor an heroic statue representing Liberty enlightening the world. What course shall our nation pursue? Send the statue of Liberty back to France and borrow from England a statue of William the Conqueror? Or shall our nation so act as to enable the American people to join with the Filipinos in placing in the harbor of Manila a statue of Liberty enlightening the Orient? [*Extract from a speech delivered at Democratic banquet, St. Paul, Minn., February 14, 1899.*]

MILITARISM

Any unnecessary increase in the regular army is open to several objections, among which may be mentioned the following:

First—It increases taxes, and thus does injustice to those who contribute to the support of the government.

Second—It tends to place force above reason in the structure of our government.

Third—It lessens the nation's dependence upon its citizen soldiery—the sheet-anchor of a republic's defense.

No one objects to the maintenance of a regular army sufficient in strength to maintain law and order in time of peace and to form the nucleus of such an army as may be required when the military establishment is placed upon a war footing; but the taxpayers are justified in entering a vigorous protest against excessive appropriations for military purposes. [*From a newspaper article on Imperialism.*]

CUBANS AND FILIPINOS

Men may dare to do in crowds what they would not dare to do as individuals, but the moral character of an act is not determined by the number of those who join it. Force can defend a right, but force has never yet created a right. If it was true, as declared in the resolution of intervention, that the Cubans "are and of right ought to be free and independent" (language taken from the Declaration of Independence), it is equally true that Filipinos "are and of right ought

to be free and independent." The right of the Cubans to freedom was not based upon their proximity to the United States, nor upon the language which they spoke, nor yet upon the race or races to which they belonged. Congress by a practically unanimous vote declared that the principles enunciated at Philadelphia in 1776 were still alive and applicable to the Cubans. Who will draw a line between the natural rights of the Cubans and the Filipinos? Who will say that the former have a right to liberty and that the latter have no rights which we are bound to respect? And, if the Filipinos "are and of right ought to be free and independent," what right have we to force our government upon them without their consent? Before our duty can be ascertained, their rights must be determined, and when their rights are once determined, it is as much our duty to respect those rights as it was the duty of Spain to respect the rights of the people of Cuba or the duty of England to respect the rights of the American colonists. Rights never conflict; duties never clash. Can it be our duty to usurp political rights which belong to others? Can it be our duty to kill those who, following the example of our forefathers, love liberty well enough to fight for it? [*Indianapolis speech in 1900.*]

The Tariff

“FAT FRYING”

The tariff question is very closely allied to the trust question, and the reduction of the tariff furnishes an easy means of limiting the extortion which the trusts can practice. While absolute free trade would not necessarily make a trust impossible, still it is probable that very few manufacturing establishments would dare to enter into a trust if the President were empowered to put upon the free list articles competing with those controlled by a trust. While I shall take occasion at an early day to consider the tariff question more at length, I can not permit this opportunity to pass without expressing the opinion that the principle embodied in the protective tariff has been the fruitful source of a great deal of political corruption as well as the mother of many of our most iniquitous trusts. It is difficult to condemn the manufacturers for uniting to take advantage of a high tariff schedule, when the schedule is framed on the theory that the industries need all the protection given and it is not likely that the beneficiaries of these schedules will consent to their reduction so long as the public waits for the tariff to be reformed by its friends.

But one of the worst features of the tariff, levied

not for revenue but for the avowed purpose of protection, is that it fosters the idea that men should use their votes to advance their own financial interests. The manufacturer has been assured that it is legitimate for him to vote for congressmen who, whatever their opinions on other subjects may be, will legislate larger dividends into his pockets; sheep growers have been encouraged to believe that they should have no higher aim in voting than to raise the price of wool; and laboring men have been urged to make their wages their only concern.

For a generation the "fat" has been fried out of the manufacturers by the republican campaign committee, and then the manufacturers have been reimbursed by legislation. With the public conscience educated to believe that this open purchase of legislation was entirely proper, no wonder that insurance companies have used the money of their policyholders to carry elections—no wonder that trusts have hastened to purchase immunity from punishment with liberal donations! How can we draw a moral distinction between the man who sells his vote for five dollars on election day and the manufacturer who sells his political influence for fifty or a hundred thousand dollars, payable in dividends? How can we draw a moral line between the senator or congressman elected by the trusts to prevent hostile legislation and the senator or congressman kept in congress by the manufacturers to secure friendly legislation? The party that justifies the one form of bribery can not be relied upon to condemn the other.

There never was a time when tariff reform could be more easily entered upon, for the manufacturers by selling abroad cheaper than at home, as many of them do, have not only shown their ingratitude toward those who built the tariff wall for them, but they have demonstrated their ability to sell in competition with the world. The high tariff has long been a burden to the consumers in the United States and it is growing more and more a menace to our foreign commerce because it arouses resentment and provokes retaliation. [*From Madison Square Garden, New York, speech, August 30, 1906.*]

TWO ARGUMENTS

Now, there are two arguments which I have never heard advanced in favor of protection; but they are the best arguments. They admit a fact and justify it, and I think that is the best way to argue, if you have a fact to meet. Why not say to the farmer, "Yes, of course you lose, but does not the Bible say, 'It is more blessed to give than to receive'—(laughter)—and if you suffer some inconvenience, just look back over your life and you will find that your happiest moments were enjoyed when you were giving something to somebody, and the most unpleasant moments were when you were receiving." These manufacturers are self-sacrificing. They are willing to take the lesser part, and the more unpleasant business of receiving, and leave to you the greater joy of giving. (Loud laughter and applause on the democratic side.)

Why do you not take the other theory, which is borne out by history—that all nations which have grown strong, powerful and influential, just as individuals have done it, through hardship, toil and sacrifice, and that after they have become wealthy they have been enervated, they have gone to decay through the enjoyment of luxury, and that the great advantage of the protective system is that it goes around among the people and gathers up their surplus earnings so that they will not be enervated or weakened, so that no legacy of evil will be left to their children. Their surplus earnings are collected up, and the great mass of our people are left strong, robust and hearty. These earnings are garnered and put into the hands of just as few people as possible, so that the injury will be limited in extent. (Great laughter and applause on the democratic side.) And they say, “Yes, of course, of course; it makes dudes of our sons, and it does, perhaps, compel us to buy foreign titles for our daughters (laughter); but of course if the great body of the people are benefited, as good, patriotic citizens we ought not to refuse to bear the burden.” (Laughter.)

Why do they not do that? They simply come to you and tell you that they want a high tariff to make low prices, so that the manufacturer will be able to pay large wages to his employes. (Laughter.) And then, they want a high tariff on agricultural products, so that they will have to buy what they buy at the highest possible price. They tell you that a tariff on wool is for the benefit of the farmer, and goes into his pocket, but that the tariff on manufactured products

goes into the farmer's pockets, too, "and really hurts us, but we will stand it if we must." They are much like a certain maiden lady of uncertain age, who said, "This being the third time that my beau has called, he might make some affectionate demonstration;" and, summing up all her courage, she added, "I have made up my mind that if he does I will bear it with fortitude." (Great laughter and applause.) [*From speech delivered in House of Representatives March 16, 1892.*]

THE GREAT HOME INDUSTRY

When some young man selects a young woman who is willing to trust her future to his strong right arm, and they start to build a little home, that home which is the unit of society and upon which our government and our prosperity must rest—when they start to build this little home, and the man who sells the lumber reaches out his hand to collect a tariff upon that; the man who sells paints and oils wants a tariff upon them; the man who furnishes the carpets, tablecloths, knives, forks, dishes, furniture, spoons, everything that enters into the construction and operation of that home—when all these hands, I say, are stretched out from every direction to lay their blighting weight upon that cottage, and the democratic party says, "Hands off, and let that home industry live," it is protecting the grandest home industry that this or any other nation ever had. (Loud applause on the democratic side.)

And I am willing that you, our friends on the other

side, shall have what consolation you may gain from the protection of those "home industries" which have crowned with palatial residences the hills of New England, if you will simply give us the credit of being the champions of the homes of this land. (Applause on the democratic side.) It would seem that if any appeal could find a listening ear in this legislative hall it ought to be the appeal that comes up from those co-tenants of earth's only paradise; but your party has neglected them; more, it has spurned and spit upon them. When they asked for bread you gave them a stone, and when they asked for a fish you gave them a serpent. You have laid upon them burdens grievous to be borne. You have filled their days with toil and their nights with anxious care, and when they cried aloud for relief you were deaf to their entreaties.

It is said that when Ulysses was approaching the island of the Sirens, warned beforehand of their seductive notes, he put wax into the ears of his sailors and then strapped himself to the mast of the ship, so that, hearing, he could not heed. So our friends upon the other side tell us that there is depression in agriculture, and a cry has come up from the people; but the leaders of your party have, as it were, filled with wax the ears of their associates, and then have so tied themselves, by promises made before the election, to the protected interests, that, hearing, they can not heed. (Applause.) [*From speech delivered in House of Representatives March 16, 1892.*]

BUSINESS AND THE TARIFF

Senator Beveridge is in error—inexcusably in error—in assuming that either in the United States or throughout the world the protective principle is firmly established; he is in error—grossly in error—when he argues that our trade can be extended as much by reciprocity treaties as by a general reduction of the tariff; and he is in error—absurdly in error—when he declares that the tariff question can be taken out of politics and settled by a few experts. It is evident that the men who have been using the protective system to gather unto themselves an undue share of the annual production of wealth are badly frightened, for nothing but fear would compel them to advocate the appointment of a commission. When they feel sure of victory, even a tariff commission is scouted; and when the people at large get ready to revise the tariff—and they seem about ready—they will not allow a tariff commission to stand between them and relief. [*From article in Reader Magazine.*]

THAT TARIFF COMMISSION

Every once in a while we hear that a tariff commission is going to be appointed. Let no one be deceived. A tariff commission is only a part of the effort to prevent a revision of the tariff. Whenever the people get ready to act, they are sagely informed that the subject is so intricate that it must be submitted to a commission of experts. The first advantage of this policy is that it secures delay. Instead of having tariff reform at once, we have the promise that it may

be reformed after awhile. The commission is usually made up of persons who are friends of the tariff and who object to revision. They take evidence, and the taking of evidence occupies time. This enables the protected interest to continue the collection of taxes for an indefinite period. Of course the commission must take time for deliberation after the evidence is all in, and then it must take more time for the preparation of its report, and if the report can be delayed until congress adjourns, further time must lapse before the matter can be taken up in congress. Then the recommendation of the commission can be used as an argument against any further reduction than the commission recommends, and the representatives of protected industry can ignore any recommendations made. It does not help either to have the commission made up of both sides of the question, for the majority will be on the side of the high tariff, and it is likely to prolong the investigation to have both sides taking testimony. When the question finally comes before congress, each representative and senator will act upon his own judgment—or by the mouthpiece of the manufacturers of his district without regard to the recommendations of the commission—and a tariff commission means a delay of from two to four years in the consideration of the question without any advantage whatever in the final settlement, and all this time the manufacturers have the benefit of the schedules against which the people complain. No wonder the tariff commission idea is brought forward every time the people threaten an attack on the tariff wall. [*From article in Reader Magazine.*]

Trusts, Corporations and Railroad Regulation

"GOOD AND BAD" TRUSTS

The first step toward the discovery of a remedy for the trusts is a recognition of the fact that private monopolies can not be classified as good or bad, but must be regarded as "indefensible and intolerable." Nothing but evil can come from an attempt to draw a line between private monopolies "benevolently managed" and others managed by persons who are not benevolently inclined. Managers may die, resign, or be removed. Bad men may be replaced by worse ones or better ones, but the position which a trust occupies before the law cannot be determined by the virtue or lack of virtue of those in charge. In choosing between a monarchy and a republic, people do not decide according to the character of the man who may at the time be at the head of the government. They decide according to the principles which underlie the government.

One of the objections to an attempt to classify trusts as good or bad is that arguments made in behalf of so-called good trusts will be used in behalf of bad trusts. But a still greater objection is that an attempt merely to regulate so-called good trusts, without at-

tacking the principle of private monopoly, results in the trusts getting hold of the government and protecting all trusts. [*From an article written for "Public Opinion" in 1905.*]

RAILROAD REGULATION

If competition was free to work in the fixing of railroad rates, the patrons of the road could protect themselves, but there is no competition at all between intermediate points, and the rates are often fixed by agreement at competing points. It is as absurd to say that the patrons should depend upon the railroad managers for justice in rates, as it would be to say that a plaintiff should submit his case to a jury made up of defendants in the case. [*From an article published in the Saturday Evening Post in 1905.*]

The republican party has persistently refused to comply with the urgent request of the Interstate Commerce Commission, for such an enlargement of the scope of the interstate commerce law as will enable the commission to realize the hopes aroused by its creation. The democratic party is pledged to legislation which will empower the commission to protect individuals and communities from discrimination, and the public at large from unjust and unfair transportation rates. [*Letter of acceptance, 1900.*]

The right of the United States government to regulate interstate commerce cannot be questioned, and

the necessity for the vigorous exercise of that right is becoming more and more imperative. The interests of the whole people require such an enlargement of the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission as will enable it to prevent discrimination between persons and places, and protect patrons from unreasonable charges. [*Letter of acceptance in 1896.*]

The railroad managers protest against inexperienced government officials being given power to fix railroad rates, but these managers overlook the fact that in reaching a decision the officials will have the benefit of the high-priced talent which the railroads employ. There is no danger that the railroads will fail to present to the officials empowered to fix rates all the facts necessary for the protection of the railroad's rights and interests. In fact, when the action of the railroad managers in regard to rates can be reviewed and set aside by officials, it is likely that the rates will be arranged with so much more fairness than they are now that the board will have less to do than now. There is no danger of injustice being done to the railroads. The great danger is that the railroads will bring to bear upon the officials such a tremendous influence as to bias them in favor of the railroads. That is the real danger. [*Commoner editorial in 1905.*]

CORPORATIONS

The democratic party makes no war upon honestly acquired wealth; neither does it seek to embarrass

corporations engaged in legitimate business, but it does protest against corporations entering politics and attempting to assume control of the instrumentalities of government. A corporation is not organized for political purposes, and should be compelled to confine itself to the business described in its charter. Honest corporations, engaged in an honest business, will find it to their advantage to aid in the enactment of such legislation as will protect them from the undeserved odium which will be brought upon them by those corporations which enter the political arena. - [*Letter of acceptance, 1900.*]

TRUSTS

Before any intelligent action can be taken against the trusts we must have a definition of a trust. Because no corporation has an absolute and complete monopoly of any important product, the apologists for the trusts sometimes insist that there are in reality no trusts. Others insist that it is impossible to legislate against such trusts as may exist without doing injury to legitimate business. For the purposes of this discussion it is sufficient to draw the line at the point where competition ceases to be effective and to designate as a trust any corporation which controls so much of the product of any article that it can fix the terms and conditions of sale.

Legislation which prevents monopoly not only does not injure legitimate business, but actually protects legitimate business from injury. We are indebted to the younger Rockefeller for an illustration which

makes this distinction clear. In defending the trust system he is quoted as saying that as the American Beauty rose cannot be brought to perfection without pinching off ninety-nine buds, so that the one-hundredth bud can receive the full strength of the bush, so great industrial organizations are impossible without the elimination of the smaller ones. It is a cruel illustration but it presents a perfectly accurate picture of trust methods. The democratic party champions the cause of the ninety-nine enterprises which are menaced; they must not be sacrificed that one great combination may flourish, and when the subject is understood we shall receive the cordial support of hundreds of thousands of business men who have themselves felt the oppression of the trusts or who, having observed the effect of the trusts upon others, realize that their safety lies, not in futile attempts at the restraint of trusts, but in legislation which will make a private monopoly impossible.

There must be no mistaking of the issue and no confusing of the line of battle. The trust, as an institution, will have few open defenders. The policy of the trust defenders will be to insist upon "reasonable regulation" and then they will rely upon their power to corrupt legislatures and to intimidate executives to prevent the application of any remedies which will interfere with the trusts. Our motto must be: "A private monopoly is indefensible and intolerable," and our plan of attack must contemplate the total and complete overthrow of the monopoly principle in industry. We need not quarrel over reme-

dies. We must show ourselves willing to support any remedy and every remedy which promises substantial advantage to the people in their warfare against monopoly. Something is to be expected from the enforcement of the criminal clause of the Sherman anti-trust law, but this law must be enforced not against a few trusts as at present, but against all trusts, and the aim must be to imprison the guilty, not merely to recover a fine. What is a fine of a thousand dollars or even ten thousand dollars to a trust which makes a hundred thousand dollars while the trial is in progress?

If the criminal clause is not going to be enforced it ought to be repealed. If imprisonment is too severe a punishment for the eminently respectable gentlemen who rob eighty millions of people of hundreds of millions of dollars annually, the language of the statute ought to be changed, for nothing is more calculated to breed anarchy than the failure to enforce the law against rich criminals while it is rigidly enforced against petty offenders. But it is not sufficient to enforce existing laws. If ten corporations conspiring together in restraint of trade are threatened with punishment, all they have to do now is to dissolve their separate corporations and turn their property over to a new corporation. The new corporation can proceed to do the same thing that the separate corporations attempted, and yet not violate the law. We need, therefore, new legislation and the republican party not only fails to enact such legislation, but fails even to promise it. The democratic party must be

prepared to propose legislation which will be sufficient.

Recent investigations have brought to light the fact that nearly all the crookedness revealed in the management of our large corporations has been due largely to the duplication of directorates. A group of men organized or obtained control of several corporations doing business with each other and then proceeded to swindle the stockholders of the various corporations for which they acted. No man can serve two masters, and the director who attempts to do so will fail, no matter how much money he makes before his failure is discovered. Many of the trusts control prices by the same methods. The same group of men secure control of several competing corporations and the management is thus consolidated. It is worth while to consider whether a blow may not be struck at the trusts by a law making it illegal for the same person to act as director or officer of two corporations which deal with each other or are engaged in the same general business.

A still more far-reaching remedy was proposed by the democratic platform in 1900, namely, the requiring of corporations to take out a federal license before engaging in interstate commerce. This remedy is simple, easily applied and comprehensive. The requiring of a license would not embarrass legitimate corporations—it would scarcely inconvenience them—while it would confine the predatory corporations to the state of their origin. Just as a federal license to sell liquor leaves the possessor of the license to sell

only in accordance with the laws of the state in which he resides, so a corporate license granted by a federal commission would not interfere with the right of each state to regulate foreign corporations doing business within its borders.

If corporations were required to take out a federal license the federal government could then issue the license upon the terms and conditions which would protect the public. A corporation differs from a human being in that it has no natural rights, and as all of its rights are derived from the statutes it can be limited or restrained according as the public welfare may require. The control which congress has over interstate commerce is complete and if congress can prevent the transportation of a lottery ticket through the mails, by the express companies or by freight, it can certainly forbid the use of the mails, the railways and the telegraph lines to any corporation which is endeavoring to monopolize an article of commerce, and no party can long be credited with sincerity if it condemns the trusts with words only and then permits the trusts to employ all the instrumentalities of interstate commerce in the carrying out of their nefarious plans. It is far easier to prevent a monopoly than to watch it and punish it, and this prevention can be accomplished in a practical way by refusing a license to any corporation which controls more than a certain proportion of the total product—this proportion to be arbitrarily fixed at a point which will give free operation to competition. [*From Madison Square Garden, New York, speech, August 30, 1906.*]

The democratic party is opposed to trusts. It would be recreant to its duty to the people of the country if it recognized either the moral or the legal right of these great aggregations of wealth to stifle competition, bankrupt rivals and then prey upon society. Corporations are the creatures of law, and they must not be permitted to pass from under the control of the power which created them; they are permitted to exist upon the theory that they advance the public weal, and they must not be allowed to use their powers for the public injury. [*Letter of acceptance in 1896.*]

Some defend trusts on the ground that they are an economic development and that they cannot be prevented without great injury to our industrial system. This may be answered in two ways: First, trusts are a political development rather than an economic one; and, second, the trust system cannot be permitted to continue even though it did result in a net economic gain. It is political because it rests upon the corporation and the corporation rests upon a statutory foundation. The trust, instead of being a natural development, is a form of legalized larceny, and can exist only so long as the law permits it to exist. That there is an economic advantage in production on a large scale may be admitted, but because a million yards of cloth can be produced in one factory at a lower price per yard than one hundred thousand yards can be produced in the same factory, it does not follow that cloth would be produced at a still

lower price per yard if all the cloth consumed in the United States were produced in one factory or under one management. There is a point beyond which the economic advantage of large production ceases. The moment an industry approaches the position of a monopoly it begins to lose in economic efficiency, for a monopoly discourages invention, invites deterioration in quality and destroys a most potent factor in production, viz.: individual ambition. But the political objections to a trust overcome any economic advantage which it can possibly have. No economic advantage can justify an industrial despotism or compensate the nation for the loss of independence among its producers. Political liberty could not long endure under an industrial system which permitted a few powerful magnates to control the means of livelihood of the rest of the people. [*From Madison Square Garden, New York, speech, August 30, 1906.*]

And what about trusts? Are they not indefensible and intolerable? Ought not the criminal law to be enforced against trusts and trust magnates? Should not the interstate corporations be compelled to sell to all on the same terms? Should not the law prevent the duplication of directors among competing corporations, and would not the proposed license system put an end to private monopoly? The reader will notice that this system does not abridge the right of the state to create corporations or to regulate, as it will, foreign corporations doing business in the state—it is a fed-

eral remedy added to the state remedies. **It will** also be noticed that it does not apply to corporations controlling less than twenty-five per cent of any product in which they deal; it does not interfere with legitimate corporations doing legitimate business but lays its hand upon those who reach out after monopoly, and it absolutely prohibits the control of more than fifty per cent of the product. If we had such a law now, every trust would be broken up. It is a simple remedy and yet an effective one and easily enforced.

The platform points out the distinction between the natural man and the artificial person called a corporation and favors the enactment of such laws as may be necessary to compel foreign corporations to submit their local disputes to the courts of the states in which they do business. This platform is aimed at the corporations which drag their litigants into the federal courts and wear them out with delays and expense. [*From editorial in The Commoner, on Nebraska platform of 1906.*]

PRIVATE MONOPOLY

A private monopoly has always been an **outlaw**. No defense can be made of an industrial system in which one, or a few, men can control for their own profit the output or price of any article of merchandise. Under such a system, the consumer suffers extortion; the producer of raw material has but one purchaser, and must sell at the arbitrary price fixed; the laborer has but one employer, and is powerless to protest against injustice, either in wages or in condi-

tions of labor; the small stockholder is at the mercy of the speculator; while the traveling salesman contributes his salary to the overgrown profits of the trust. Since but a small proportion of the people can share in the advantages secured by private monopoly, it follows that the remainder of the people are not only excluded from the benefits, but are the helpless victims of every monopoly organized. It is difficult to overestimate the immediate injustice that may be done, or to calculate the ultimate effect of this injustice upon the social and political welfare of the people.

Our platform, after suggesting certain specific remedies, pledges the party to an unceasing warfare against private monopoly in nation, state and city. I heartily approve of this promise; if elected, it shall be my earnest and constant endeavor to fulfill the promise in letter and spirit. I shall select an attorney-general who will, without fear or favor, enforce existing laws; I shall recommend such additional legislation as may be necessary to dissolve every private monopoly which does business outside of the state of its origin; and, if, contrary to my belief and hope, a constitutional amendment is found to be necessary, I shall recommend such an amendment as will, without impairing any of the existing rights of the states, empower congress to protect the people of all the states from injury at the hands of individuals or corporations engaged in interstate commerce. [*Letter of acceptance, 1900.*]

Before the Economic Club, New York

The Economic club gave a dinner at Hotel Astor, New York, February 5. There were seven hundred guests, among them many New York bankers and capitalists. Mr. Bryan was one of the speakers. Victor Morawetz, Andrew Carnegie and Lyman J. Gage, former secretary of the treasury, preceded Mr. Bryan on the program. Mr. Baker, who took part in the dialogue, is president of the First National bank of New York City.

The Commoner presents a stenographic report of the proceedings beginning with Toastmaster Stetson's introduction.

Following is the stenographic report:

Mr. Stetson: I think that Mr. Gage underestimated his power as a pulpit orator, yet I do not think he can hold a rushlight in that capacity to the next gentleman, whom I regard as the greatest pulpit orator of our day, Mr. Bryan. (Great and continuous applause.)

Mr. Bryan: Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I have had a number of delusions shattered here tonight. I had understood that for the last forty-seven years our financial affairs had been in the hands of men who possessed all the qualities that Mr. Gage has suggested a commission should possess. And now to learn from

excellent American and Scottish authority that we not only have the worst system in the world, but worse than he, with his fruitful imagination, could imagine, what shall I say to my people when I go back home? How shall I explain that three conspicuous financiers who have given this subject great thought, and who know all the intricacies of finance, should be agreed upon but one proposition, and that is, that they do not know what ought to be done. (Applause and laughter.)

I am assured by one of them that that is not a fair statement. I will withdraw any statement that is considered unfair, although it seems to me that after I have traveled 1,500 miles to drink in wisdom from authoritative sources it is a breach of promise, at least, (laughter) not to give me some information. And yet, as each one approached the important part of the subject, he concluded that we ought to have a commission to consider the matter. Is it not strange that the commission is always resorted to by those who do not care to elaborate before an election a plan that might not be popular at the election? (Great applause.) Is it not strange that all of our great financial programs are brought out just after the election, when the people cannot sit in judgment upon the subject? (Applause.)

The time allotted to me is not sufficient to answer all of the financial fallacies that have been advanced tonight. I, the champion of sound money (great laughter) have not time to defend the honest dollar from the attacks that have been made upon it. (Laughter.) And as I listened to those from whom I expected some clear specific remedy, I was reminded

of the words of the great apostle, and I do not know but I might paraphrase those words and say, "That sound finance which ye ignorantly worship, that come I to declare unto you." (Great laughter and applause.)

When I defend anything that we have in finance, you will not accuse me of defending anything with which I have had any connection. These greenbacks that have been described in uncomplimentary language were not issued by me or by my party. (Laughter.) But it seems to me that it is straining a point to denounce the government for issuing 346 millions of promises to pay, bearing no interest, when he (Ex-Secretary Gage) does not denounce the issue of 700 millions of bank promises to pay, that bear no interest. If a bank's promise to pay, bearing no interest, is fit to serve as money, why should not a government's promise to pay, bearing no interest, be fit to serve as money?

I understand that the subject tonight is the currency question as it presents itself at this time, and, therefore, it is not necessary to discuss our whole financial system. I do not want to enter into the discussion of a subject as large as our financial system. But I remind you, that if we follow the suggestion that nothing but gold be considered good for reserves, then we will either have to stop making deposits in the banks, or increase our gold so that we can keep in the banks a reserve large enough to protect the banks in the doing of their business. (Applause.) We have not the gold in this country and we cannot get it without drawing gold from countries that need it. If we draw the gold from

other countries, and discard the use of money that serves today in the place of gold, then the effect must be to diminish prices in foreign countries and lessen their ability to trade with us.

Today we hold in our reserves not only gold, but silver and silver certificates and greenbacks. And the silver and silver certificates and greenbacks amount to 946 millions, 600 millions of silver and 346 millions of greenbacks. We have about 1,200 millions of gold in the country; that is the best estimate that I have been able to get. Now if we are going to discard, as has been suggested, the use of silver and greenbacks, we must go somewhere and get 946 millions of dollars of gold, and it will not be an easy matter. How can we get it? I will tell you one way to get it; make the farmer sell his foreign export for less, and lay upon him the burden of getting the money to substitute for silver and the greenback. That may please some, but I am not surprised that it is not advanced seriously pending a campaign, for it would not please the producing masses of this country. (Applause.)

It is not my business to explain this panic. I have not felt as much of it as some of you have. In fact, my connection with it has not been embarrassing. (Laughter.) And politically my connection with it has been anything but embarrassing, for it has at least robbed the country of the argument that my party was the only party under whose administration a panic could come. (Great laughter and applause.)

If I were a financier and my word was good on finance, I would say that instead of locating the blame

on too large an issue of paper money, it ought to be located on the issue of stocks and bonds that do not represent value or even honesty in business. (Great applause.) The gentleman (Ex-Secretary Gage) did me the honor to quote something that I said last night. I am glad that he quoted; I was afraid it would not get into the papers. The fact that he quoted it shows that it appeared in print and I am gratified. And, my friends, I do not overstate it. In fact, knowing that I was where language was carefully examined I was especially cautious as to the use of language, and I shall not put this government, which bought silver at sixty cents and coined it into a dollar, in the same category or company with those who floated the billions of dollars of stocks and bonds that represented nothing but the expectation that those who issued them would, unmolested, reach their hands into the pockets of the people and draw from them dividends to which they were not entitled. The government did buy silver at sixty cents and coin it into a dollar and no man who took the dollar ever lost one cent, and that cannot be said of the men who took the securities and suffered a shrinkage of one-half. So much for the cause of the panic.

But, my friends, the study of causes does not help us unless it suggests remedies, and it seems to me it is time to suggest remedies. I have heard that elastic currency was necessary. I am led to the conclusion tonight that we have overestimated the need for elasticity, for if we can postpone for a year the getting of that elasticity, merely because the campaign is on, the need

is not as urgent as I had been led to think. (Great applause and laughter.) I had been losing sleep at night (Cries: You don't look like it!), wondering how long it would be before we could respond to the urgent need for elastic currency. I had been anxious that as little time should intervene as possible, and have been much disturbed by the failure of our advisers to agree upon some plan which would at once relieve the stringency. We have two bills in congress, one known as the Aldrich bill and one known as the Fowler bill. The Aldrich bill attempts to provide an emergency currency by the issue of bank notes upon certain specific securities deposited with the government. The Fowler bill contemplates an entire change in our bank currency. It is even more radical than that proposed by the Aldrich bill. At present the bank notes rest on government bonds and I do not think it is so absurd, as Mr. Gage seems to, that the government should make its bonds the basis of notes, if we are to have bank notes, or that the government should guarantee the notes that rest upon its own bonds. And the stringency is not now as great as it would have been if there had been doubt as to the ability of the banks to redeem their notes. The best feature of the bank note is the government guarantee; when men take it, they do not ask whether the bank is a good one, they take it because the government is back of it. Here is the difficulty about the emergency currency proposed. It must either be a bank currency or a government currency, and those who want a bank currency seem to be so determined that it shall be a bank currency that

they are not willing that the distress shall be relieved by a government currency. In other words, the principle involved is to them more than the need to be supplied. Certainly, the emergency is not great if it can be postponed or defeated merely because you have to accept a government note instead of a bank note. The first thing to be considered is whether this should be a government note or a bank note. If I were discussing the Aldrich bill, there are several features which I would criticise, one of them the use of the railroad bond as a security. If I were discussing the Fowler bill, there are a number of features of that bill that I would criticise. The Aldrich bill proposes a bank note resting on various kinds of bonds, and the Fowler bill proposes a bank note resting upon no bonds, but upon the assets of the banks. I prefer that the emergency currency shall be a United States note, and not a bank note at all. I am not afraid to trust the United States; am not afraid to have its notes issued. And I remind those who are fond of bank notes, that when gold and silver went to a premium, the banker did not take the trouble to go out and find gold and silver. The greenback was good enough for him; he redeemed bank notes with it. Concede the point that this note shall be a government note and it will be easy then to agree upon the security upon which it shall be loaned. And, my friends, I would not appreciate your courtesy as I do, if I did not speak to you frankly. I do not live in New York. I am some distance from New York, but we in the West have had experience. How many banks have suspended in New York? How many in Brook-

lyn? Our experience teaches us that it is better to trust the government than to trust the financiers in the control of money. If any of you think that proposition unsound, present the opposite proposition and give the voters a chance to express themselves. This is a government of eighty millions of people and not a government of six thousand bank presidents. No financial system can be expected to be permanent in this country that does not have back of it the hearty approval of the public. We are told that this must be left to a commission made up of men who will put their patriotism above their party. Financiers are not the only patriotic men. You can find men in every hamlet who put their patriotism above their party. A few people cannot settle these things for the rest of the people. If you appoint your commission, the bill, when it comes in, has to be passed upon by all the people through their representatives in congress. Now, if you concede the point that the government shall issue the money then it becomes a matter of detail. The government can meet the need simply and quickly, and I believe provision should be made for the issue by the government of United States notes, like our greenbacks in form and in redemption, and that these United States notes should be loaned by the government upon sufficient security and at a rate of interest which will compel the retirement of the notes when the emergency is over. I am not sure but we could combine the suggestions made in different bills. One suggests that bonds be deposited, state, county and municipal bonds, and we have between two and three billions

of them. They would make a good basis. All the government needs is security, if it is going to loan the money, and these would make good security. I do not think that railway or industrial bonds ought to be used for such security. Mr. M. E. Ingalls suggests that the country be divided into clearing house districts, enough so that there will be a representation of the needs of different communities. He suggests that these clearing houses might borrow from the government on collateral other than bonds. I will go further than that. If we create a district and authorize the clearing house of the district to bind all the banks of the district, the government could loan money to it without any specific security, for it has back of it all the assets of all the banks. And if the loan was limited to a certain per cent, say, for instance, to twenty or twenty-five per cent of the total capital and surplus of the banks, there could be no loss to the government. But there is no difficulty about details. If we need emergency currency, if elasticity is desired, it is possible to provide it without any change in our monetary system. Without any innovations at all, it is possible to provide all the elasticity for which anybody can show a need. And are we asking too much when we insist that this shall be in the control of the government and not in the hands of individuals?

What we need, I think, even more than an increase in our currency, is confidence. Think of it! (Applause.) I am now the evangel of confidence. I am now the "advance agent" of confidence. If we can bring money from hiding and hoarding and get it

into the banks, the banks will have more money to loan than we can possibly furnish them by any emergency currency. What we need today is to restore confidence to the depositors. John Wanamaker was quoted as saying—I cannot rely entirely on what the newspapers say—but he was quoted as saying that a billion dollars was hidden under carpets. The government only loaned the banks about 250 million dollars and if Mr. Wanamaker is right we have four times as much in hiding. The postmaster general, in recommending a postal savings bank, says that we are sending out many millions every year to be deposited in government banks in Europe, by people who are not willing to trust our banks. The people of this country are being driven to the postal savings bank because they need a place to deposit their money where they can get it when they want it. Some of you have thought me very anxious to enlarge the work of the government. I have never insisted that the government should undertake any business that could be done satisfactorily by the individual. I believe in individualism; I want the individual to have the largest possible sphere of action.

And only where it is impossible for the individual to act, or unsafe for the community that he should act, have I suggested that the government should act. I have believed for years that if the banks did not allow the banking to be made safe they would drive the country to the postal savings bank. I would rather have the banking done by the bankers than by the government. (Applause.) I am in favor of the postal

savings bank, but a postal savings bank is only an alternative to be selected if we cannot get the security that the people demand.

And today, the greatest need we have is legislation that will make people feel that when they deposit money in the banks they can go and get it whenever they want it; the stringency that has spread over this country in a night has taught the people the necessity for this protection.

They tell us that the timidity which people have manifested is not justified. That is generally true. I am not prepared to speak for this community, but I am sure that in the West there is no reasonable excuse for this timidity. (Laughter.) Our crops have been bountiful; our prices have been good; our people have money; they fill the banks with their money, and there was so much that they sent a large part of it down here to New York to be invested, and they have been waiting, waiting, waiting for its return. (Laughter.) Our banks are good, and yet, my friends, when a bank suspends payment on checks you need not be surprised if the ultra-timid become alarmed and want to get their money out. (Laughter.) If I were a banker I would not be proud of a system that had to run rivalry with a carpet as a safety deposit vault, and have the carpet preferred in times of stress. (Laughter.) A man does not hide money under a carpet if he can find any safer place. (Laughter.) I repeat that what we need today is to make the bank safe. You may laugh down here in New York, but in Oklahoma you call it a wild western state—the first thing that was to

pass a law to guarantee bank deposits. How did they do it? They authorized a banking board to collect an assessment on the 17th of this month of one per cent on the deposits of the banks. I think it is higher than necessary; one-half of one per cent would have been enough, one-fourth of one per cent would have been sufficient, but they said one per cent and they empowered the board to assess at any time and to any extent necessary to keep that reserve intact. And thus they put behind every bank the assets of all the banks. In anticipation of the operation of that law, the bankers of Kansas petitioned their governor to call a special session of the legislature to pass a law like it so as to keep the money from being drawn out of Kansas banks and deposited in Oklahoma. (Great laughter.)

And the legislature is now in session. It will enact such a law. It has been introduced in Illinois. It has been introduced in Ohio, and I had the honor to receive an invitation from the republican legislature of Ohio to come and address that legislature on a guaranteed bank. Possibly, I was invited because some fourteen years ago I tried to secure the enactment of such a law by congress. We had a failure in our town and many poor people suffered the loss of their savings and the hardships visited upon our community caused such a cry of distress that someone came to me—I wish I could remember his name—and suggested a guarantee fund, and I introduced in congress a bill that provided for the collection of a small tax each year until a guarantee fund was provided. The bill provided that when a bank failed the comptroller should from this fund pay

every depositor immediately, so that there would be no interruption of business to the community and no loss to the depositor, and then proceed to collect the assets of the bank and reimburse the fund as far as the assets would go.

Now that was some thirteen or fourteen years ago. What was the objection raised? That if all the banks were good, the big banks would not have any advantage over the little ones—that the depositors should all be unsecured that the big banks might have an advantage over the little banks. Where is the patriotism that we have been hearing about in our financiers? Do they insist upon a system that requires that the depositor shall have his interests jeopardized, and that the community shall suffer that the big banks may have an advantage over the little banks?

I went out to Nebraska and got that bill introduced there. I thought, surely, if we cannot have it in the United States we can have it in Nebraska. (Laughter.) But when the bill came up there was a lobby of national bankers to oppose it. "Why," they said, "if state banks are safe, people will not deposit in national banks." (Laughter.) What is the objection now? Mr. Forgan, the head of one of the largest banks in Chicago, stated as his objection that it would make all banks secure. (Laughter.) What an objection! He said that, under such a system, you could just step into any bank and deposit your money! That would be awful! (Applause.) I ask you this question, my friends, must we leave the depositor helpless? Must we leave the community helpless rather than have all

banks secure? What is more important than the security of the depositor? Why not look at this question once from the standpoint of eighty millions of people who have lost hundreds of millions of dollars in this particular crisis that they never can get back? Is that not sufficient reason for a different plan, or shall we sit back and say, "No, it would not do to make all banks secure, for then the big banks would not have any advantage over the little banks." The big bank will still have an advantage over the little bank. It does not need to rest upon the insecurity of all. The fact that it has a large capital and surplus enables it to loan more to one individual than the small banks can. A bank can only loan one-tenth of its capital and surplus to one person, and a bank that has ten times the capital and surplus of another can accommodate the man who wants to borrow large sums. Isn't that an advantage? And then there is another advantage. It has an advantage resting upon vanity. People like to do business with the big banks; they like to go in and have the president of the biggest bank bow to them and smile. (Laughter.) Isn't that some advantage? Wouldn't that remain, even when all banks were safe?

What is the other objection? They say that, if all the banks are secure and the depositor cannot lose, the banks will be recklessly managed. I am glad that that argument is made now, when we have seen the extreme care that is exercised under present conditions. (Laughter and applause.) My good friend here, Chairman Stetson, suggested that a difference as large as an ocean separated him from some of the speakers, and I

thought I could notice a slight inclination of the head in my direction. (Laughter.) I wonder if there can be a large gulf between us on this subject. The manager becomes careless! Why, my friends, the officers of the bank are selected by the directors and the directors are chosen by the stockholders, and the stockholders would lose all of their capital, all their surplus and then they would have to respond to the 100 per cent liability before any other bank could lose anything; wouldn't that be enough to make the officers careful? If that isn't enough, suppose we try the criminal law and see if that will make them careful. What has been the difficulty with our banks? Our financiers will tell you that the banks that have failed have failed in almost every instance because the officers of the bank have violated their trust and used the money of other people to advance their own private interests! Isn't that true, Mr. Gage?

Mr. Gage: Yes, sir.

Mr. Bryan: Isn't that true, Mr. Baker?

Mr. Baker: Yes, sir.

Mr. Bryan: Why hasn't it been remedied? Because the managers of the bad banks don't want to be restrained and the good bank isn't anxious to have the other ones restrained, because the good bank can point to the recklessness of the others and draw away deposits.

I am not supposed to know anything about banking, and yet these distinguished men, who have shed lustre on the banking business, admit that I have put my finger upon the sore place in the banking system.

Now when we make all the banks responsible for each bank then they will be interested in effective regulation. We will find them favoring legislation that will protect the public from a misappropriation of funds. We have been asking for this regulation all the time. I introduced a bill in congress to increase the penalty for embezzlement where the amount was large; I supposed that I would have unanimous support. I supposed that the stockholders would be glad to hold over their officers the danger of a longer penal term if they were dishonest and took money, but I could not get that through. (Laughter.)

I welcome the prospect of guaranteed banks because I think it will enable us to get some regulation that we need. For instance, I think it might help us to pass a law to make more than directory the rule that a bank shall not loan more than one-tenth of its capital and surplus to one person. A man testified in the case of a Chicago banker last summer that that law was merely directory; that if an examiner found that a bank was loaning more than ten per cent to one man, the department would send him a formal letter calling his attention to it, and then if he did not correct it by the next examination, he might expect to be forcibly reminded by another courteous letter. Is that good banking? Is that safe and sound finance? If one-tenth of the capital and the surplus is all that ought to be loaned under our present system, if it is the judgment of those who make the law that the loan shall not exceed that, then I insist that we ought to make a criminal law, to compel the officers to do that which they were

directed to do by the authorities. (Applause.)
Wouldn't that be a good law, Mr. Gage?

Mr. Gage: Yes, sir.

Mr. Bryan: Would not that be a good law, Mr. Baker?

Mr. Baker: Yes, sir.

Mr. Bryan: My friends, if I keep on I will be in standing after a while. (Laughter and applause.) Now I think there is another thing that we ought to have. I think more of the reserve ought to be kept in the bank and less loaned. Isn't that right?

Voices: Right again. (Laughter and applause.)

If more of the reserve is kept in the bank, the bank can be allowed to keep a part of it in bonds upon which emergency notes can be borrowed from the government. It was the deposit of western and southern reserves in New York that caused the stringency to spread throughout the country. Now, I want to remind you that for forty-seven years our laws have been made by financiers, and yet we reach the condition which confronts us today, and eminent bankers admit here in your presence, that I, a farmer from Nebraska, can suggest changes that your financiers did not think of, or at least, did not put into law. (Laughter.) Why?

A Voice: You ought to be right part of the time. (Laughter.)

Mr. Bryan: Thanks, it is a concession that I appreciate, and I wish I could return the compliment by saying that our financiers have been right even part of the time. (Great applause and laughter.)

Now there is another safeguard. I would like to see

a law that would make it a criminal offense for any bank official to become a gambler upon the stock market. Don't wait until he has lost or committed suicide, but make it criminal to begin. Save the man's life, and his honor and his family by protecting him from the temptation.

I read, a few years ago, that a bank official found that the market had gone against him and shot himself; and another official who was associated with him in the bank came in and found him dead, and knowing that he had shared in the dead man's speculation he shot himself and fell dead across the body of the other man.

In Iowa, not long ago, I was told that within a radius of, I think it was one hundred miles, ten bankers had committed suicide as the result of speculation. It would be a mercy to these men to protect them from this temptation. The man who has in his keeping the money of others ought to be protected, as far as the law can protect him, from the temptation to gamble. Am I not right?

Voices: You are; you are.

Mr. Bryan: Again I am right. (Applause.)

Now I am afraid that I have talked over my time. (Cries of "go on, go on.") When you say "go on, go on," I am reminded of a fellow down in Kentucky who was making a speech. He had to leave on a certain train. When he saw the time was near for his train to depart, he said: "My train will go in a moment now," and they said, "go on, go on." And he talked until his train had gone. Finally he stopped and

said: "You see, gentlemen, that I have been persuaded by your entreaties to miss my train." They said, "Why, we told you to go on." (Laughter and applause.) I am not sure just what you may mean by "go on." (Laughter.)

Now I have said what I have upon this question because I believe it should be presented. It is not necessary to wait until the election is over to find out what ought to be done. Take a plan that appeals to the common sense of the average man and you need not be afraid to present it before election. The people of this country are the most intelligent people in the world. They want to do what is right. Some of you misunderstand our people. (Laughter.) You think we are anarchists. You think we want to injure the country. I think I am a fair representative of the average man out in the West, at least I have been able to keep in touch with him in spite of all the newspapers. He and I get along pretty well together. Why? Because I have tried to appeal to the hearts and consciences and judgment of these men. You have said that we are arraying class against class. It is false.

You have accused us of disregarding property rights. That is not true. The man who defends human rights is the best defender of property rights. (Applause.) The man who prosecutes the wrongdoer is the best friend of honesty. (Applause.) And all that we have asked is that you view this great question from the bottom and not from the top.

There is a theory that God selected a few men and endowed them with greater wisdom and fitness, and

then put the country in their hands. That used to be the theory. First, it was the king who could do no wrong; then it was the aristocracy that ruled; now it is the democracy.

These men, whose deposits make your banking profits; these men whose deposits are the basis of your fortunes—these men ought to be considered—not only their interests but their opinions. . You like to persuade a man that the bank is a good place to deposit his money, and if his judgment is good when you are trying to persuade him to deposit his money in your bank, trust his judgment a little when he wants to regulate the methods to be employed by those who have charge of his money. (Applause.) We will have to meet this issue sometime, and we may as well do so frankly and boldly now. If our finances had been conducted as they ought to have been, there would have been no stringency now. If you tell me that you need an elastic currency, I will take your word for it, but if you tell me that you object to it unless you can hold both ends of the elastic, I will tell you that you do not need it as much as you thought you did. Trust the government, the representatives elected by the people. These men, acting in the open and responsible to their constituents, are more trustworthy than those who act behind closed doors, and are responsible to no one but themselves. I think you will have to consider the opinions of the voters on this question, whether you try to settle it now or by a commission selected for the purpose of preparing a bill that you would not present before the

election. It must come before the people and you might as well take them into your confidence first as last.

If you want this elastic currency let the government issue it and control it, and you will have no difficulty about the security. Then lay upon the banks the responsibility for making the banks safe. If the banks say that they do not want to be held responsible for other banks, my answer is that if your bankers will not trust each other, they should not expect the people to trust them with their money. (Applause.)

The slight tax that this plan contemplates would be more than compensated for by the money drawn from hiding that you could then loan out and on which you could charge interest. This is a system that protects the depositor, protects the community, and gives the banks a large advantage at a small price.

I thank you for this opportunity to speak to you; it is the first I have had. I have been talking for many years, and this is the most respectable crowd that I have ever talked to in my life—(laughter and applause)—that is, measured by New York standards. (Laughter.) It is no more respectable, however, than the people among whom I live! The man who toils by the day, who goes out in the morning and works all day, who commences in the spring and works all summer, though his hand be hard from work, and his clothing not of the latest cut—he is a respectable man, and I have been addressing respectable audiences all

over the country, but this is the most highly financial audience that I have yet addressed. (Applause.)

And if I have exceeded my time limit and spoken with an earnestness for which I should apologize, just remember how long I have waited for the opportunity, and remember also that I may never have it again. (Prolonged applause.)

“Thou Shalt Not Steal”

The commandment “Thou shalt not steal” presents as clearly as it can be presented a moral truth that may be classed among the self-evident truths. The greatest service that one can render a truth is to state it so plainly that it can be understood. I do not mean that any truth can be stated so plainly that it will not be denied by those who find it to their interest to deny it. I believe that it was Lord Macaulay who said that eloquent and learned men could be found to dispute the law of gravitation if any pecuniary advantage were to be gained by it. What I mean to say is, that a truth can be stated so plainly that those who desire to see it, can see it, and that when it is seen, it needs no defense. If, for instance, you may say to a man that it is wrong to steal and he replies: “Oh, I don’t know about that,” don’t argue with him, search him, and you will probably find the reason in his pocket.

I have not selected this subject with any intention of presenting an argument against stealing. I am going to assume that those who listen to me agree that the commandment should be obeyed. It is my purpose rather to make some applications of the commandment to present conditions, for I am satisfied that many are guilty without really being conscious

of disobedience to the commandment or of committing a wrong.

To steal or to commit larceny may be defined as the wrongful taking of another's property. Law writers have divided larceny into two classes—petit larceny and grand larceny—the former term being used when the property stolen is of little value and the latter when the value is greater. There is a tendency in modern times to divide grand larceny into two classes, so that now we are inclined to think of larceny as petit larceny, grand larceny and glorious larceny. By glorious larceny I do not refer to the policy which nations have indulged in of taking the property of other nations by force—an act that is sometimes described as not only innocent but even patriotic; I refer rather to that tendency, quite discernible at the present day, to regard stealing upon a large scale as less reprehensible than stealing upon a small scale. If a man picks your pocket, or enters your house in the dark, or accosts you upon the highway and takes from you a few dollars, you regard him as a vulgar thief. No one can have respect for such a person, and the punishments of the law are in such cases swift and sure, if the offender is caught. Even in the case of grand larceny, if the amount taken is not very great, the thief finds it difficult to escape, for he has no influential friends and he cannot hire skillful lawyers to present technicalities in his defense. If, however, he steals a large sum, it becomes quite a different matter, and the sum may be so large that we overlook the man's rascality in our amazement at the genius

which he has displayed. As a rule, the man who steals a million dollars has a better chance of escape than the man who steals a thousand. So true is this that it has been suggested that we amend the commandment to read, "Thou shalt not steal *upon a small scale.*" Judge Jerry Black, the celebrated Pennsylvania lawyer, in his argument in the Credit Mobilier case, quoted a man of affairs as saying that to rob an individual was criminal, to rob a corporation was reprehensible, to rob a municipality was a matter of doubtful morality, to rob a state was meritorious—but to rob the United States was the highest achievement of human virtue. We should attempt to cultivate a public opinion which will remove the distinction between grand larceny and glorious larceny and insure the enforcement of the criminal law against all offenders alike, regardless of the amount stolen and regardless of the social, business or political position of the thief.

But my object tonight is rather to draw your attention to the various ways in which larceny may be committed. There is a distinction that can be drawn between direct and indirect larceny; that is, between the one who does the stealing himself and the one who does it through another, and this is a larger subject than at first appears, for those who produce conditions which result in such gross injustice that the victims of the injustice are driven to destitution, to despair, to desperation, and finally to theft—those who produce these conditions are not entirely guiltless. But the discussion of this subject will lead us

into sociology, and I want to confine myself to criminology.

For the purposes of this discussion, let us divide larceny into two classes—larceny in violation of the law and larceny through the operation of law. While both branches of the subject are important, the second branch is the larger and the less considered. I think I am within the truth when I say that, measured by the value of the property taken, stealing through the operation of law, if not so frequent, reaches a larger aggregate than stealing in violation of the law. But the stealing which is done in violation of law is enormous and the methods employed many. Take for illustration the administration of our tax laws. Let us suppose that the law is made by well-meaning legislators, and in its requirements approaches justice as closely as fallible man can approach justice. The assessor is sometimes corrupted—not always by money, but more often by influence. That is, the person favored does not always pay the assessor a fixed sum, but helps to elect him or re-elect him, and thus becomes responsible for the continuation of his salary.

Inequality in taxation is merely a form of larceny. If two men live side by side and one contributes in taxation ten dollars when his just share is only five dollars, and the other pays only five when he ought to pay ten, one loses five dollars that he ought to keep, while the other keeps five dollars that he ought to give to the government. The effect in this case is just the same as if one man took the other man's property and applied it to his own use. The fact

that the government, acting as a collector, took the five dollars from the man who is overburdened and gave it to the man who is underburdened does not change the character of the transaction.

If inequality in taxation is due to the act of an assessor who, at the solicitation of a property owner, under-assesses him, then the assessor and the man favored are guilty of the wrongful taking of the property of another. If we examine the assessment books in any city we will find many instances such as that above mentioned. One piece of property will be assessed at half its value, another piece of property at a third of its value, and still another at a fourth of its value, and where there is this difference in the basis of assessment, the discrimination is usually in favor of the large property holder who is able to exert an influence upon the assessor to bias him in favor of an undervaluation.

Not only is the large business block often favored at the expense of the small home, but the property of big corporations is often favored at the expense of individual holders. Take, for instance, a street car company, a water plant or a gas plant. On the stock market these franchise-holding corporations never forget to count in the value of the franchise, and this intangible asset is sometimes as valuable as the physical properties owned by the corporation. Taxes are generally estimated on the basis of physical property, while the dividends are paid upon the face value of the stocks and bonds. It seems strange that a corporation which receives a valuable franchise from the

public as a gift should refuse to pay taxes in proportion to the market value of its stocks and bonds, and yet, there is scarcely a city or state in which the public is not in a constant struggle to compel franchise-holding corporations to pay their share of the taxes, and even then the basis upon which they pay is notoriously lower than the basis upon which the individual property owner, especially the small property owner, pays.

If a certain sum is to be collected in taxes and some pay less than they should, the others must pay more than their share. Is it not worth while to insist that both the under-assessed citizen and the unscrupulous official shall obey the commandment, "Thou shalt not steal?"

I need not waste time on the tax dodger or the smuggler, for those who, by concealment, deliberately deceive the assessor or collector are as guilty of larceny as if they boldly took the property of others.

But what if the fault is in the law itself? What shall we say if those who make the law, write it with the intention of overburdening some and releasing others from just obligations? Time does not permit an extended discussion of the various systems of taxation. If we were discussing the question of taxation in a fundamental way, we would have to consider the claims of all systems, existing and proposed, but I am not now considering new systems, but rather the injustice connected with the systems in operation. In local taxation we are constantly confronted with the question, "Shall personal property be taxed?" and

there are many who argue that because personal property is difficult to locate, it should be exempt. This argument is based upon the theory that it is better not to attempt to collect a tax upon personal property than to make an unsuccessful attempt. While I recognize that it is easier to collect taxes on visible than on invisible property, I am convinced that the owners of visible property should not pay their own taxes, and, in addition thereto, the taxes that ought to be paid by the owners of invisible property. The farmer, for instance, has his money invested in lands, in improvements and in stock. All of these can be found and their value estimated. If in the cities there are people of great wealth who, instead of owning lands and buildings and cattle and hogs, own money, and notes, and bonds, is it fair that the owners of money and securities shall be exempt from taxation? The man who loans usually requires security—not only security but a margin to cover possible shrinkage in the value of the property upon which the security rests; that is, the man who owes him must suffer a considerable loss before the creditor suffers any. Is it fair that the man who thus must take his chances upon the seasons and run the risks of business, should also pay the taxes of the one who is able to protect himself from ordinary risks and chances? If the law is made by those who escape taxation, are they not taking the property of others in violation of morals, even when they act in accordance with the laws which they have secured?

The government is a mighty power for good or for

evil, for justice or for injustice, and when the government itself can be manipulated for the enforcement of a law which rests upon injustice, great harm can be done. Is it stretching the definition of larceny to make it cover the wrongful taking of a man's property through unjust legislation? I might hesitate to use such strong language were it not for the fact that the Supreme Court of the United States has used just such language in what is known as the Topeka (Kansas) case. Justice Miller, in delivering the opinion of the court, said, "To lay with one hand the power of the government on the property of the citizen and with the other to bestow it upon favored individuals to aid private enterprises and build up private fortunes is none the less a robbery because it is done under the forms of law and is called taxation."

"Robbery" is even a stronger word than larceny, but I am so conservative in my language that I prefer to use the more polite phrase and leave the harsher term to our court of last resort.

In national taxation we have not made as near an approach to justice as we have in state and municipal taxation. In national taxation we collect almost all of our revenues for the support of the federal government from internal revenue taxes and from import duties. These taxes rest upon consumption and are collected in proportion to consumption. We tax people according to their needs rather than according to their possessions, and men's needs are more uniform than their possessions. Men do not use tobacco, consume liquor, buy food or wear clothing in proportion

to their wealth or in proportion to their income, and taxes upon consumption always overburden the poor and underburden the rich. When the income tax was under discussion it was insisted that it collected a tribute from thrift and industry, but are not all taxes income taxes? They must be paid out of the income, even though they are not proportioned to the income. Taxes upon consumption are therefore income taxes; they are more than that, they are graduated taxes upon income, and the heaviest per cent falls upon the lowest income. Adam Smith has laid it down as a rule that people ought to pay taxes in proportion to the benefits which they receive from their government, and those who look to the government for the protection of large possessions ought to be willing to pay in proportion to the protection which they receive. Our police officers, our fire departments, our courts, our armies and our navies are supported more for the protection of property than for the protection of life, and it is only fair that taxation should, as far as possible, take into consideration the benefits given in return.

I am aware that it is not possible to devise any system of taxation which will be perfectly fair and absolutely equitable, but I am afraid that we have not always made justice and fairness the first consideration. The income tax has been opposed by men who would have their taxes increased and by men whose taxes ought to be increased, and I have had a suspicion that our import duties have in some cases been levied for the purpose of giving some industries

an advantage over other industries—to give a few of the people a profit at the expense of the rest of the people. The reason why unjust taxation continues is that those who receive in large quantities exert an undue influence upon legislators, while those who pay, each a small amount, are too often indifferent to the exactions.

The contest between the tax payer on the one side and the tax eater on the other is always an unequal contest, because the tax eater is vigilant and ever present, while the tax payer is at home trying to make enough to meet the next assessment. For this reason appropriations grow apace and unjust systems of taxation find eloquent defense from orators and newspapers. If I were to attempt to enter into detail, I might run counter to the preconceived notions of many in this audience, but I venture to call your attention to the subject in the hope that as conscientious men and women you will study the question of taxation with the determination to eliminate the element of larceny wherever it appears and put taxation upon a just foundation, so that each citizen will contribute his fair share to the burdens of the government under whose protection we all live.

And now, if you will bear with me a moment, I will take up another subject which illustrates how larceny can be practiced by law. A change in the monetary standard of a country affords an opportunity for the wrongful taking of property. A few years ago the debtor class in this country was complaining because of a rising dollar; during the last few years

the creditor class has been complaining of a falling dollar. That is, from 1873 to 1897 the general level of prices fell, and, roughly speaking, a dollar would buy more and more each year. From 1897 up to a few months ago prices have been rising and a dollar would buy less and less each year. Now, there can be no doubt that falling prices help the man who owns the dollars, while rising prices help the man who owes dollars. I do not know that it is necessary to elaborate upon this, because the quantitative theory of money is now generally accepted, and the quantitative theory of money is stated in the proposition that, other factors remaining the same, the purchasing power of a dollar decreases as the number of dollars increases, or, to state it in a different way, prices rise when the volume of money increases. When the general level of prices rises or falls, all business is adjusted to it, but some things more slowly than others. There are certain fixed charges, such as the expenses of government, which do not respond quickly to a change in the level of prices. Take for instance debts, railroad rates and official salaries. When prices were falling the dollars called for by a note or bond increased in purchasing power, and the one who collected the dollars, collected this increase, his principal rising in fact, though not in figures. The interest itself increased, for, while the rate remained the same, the purchasing power of the annual interest grew. And so also, with railroad rates. A fixed rate per ton or a passenger rate of three cents per mile became more and more to the railroad and cost more and more to the shipper or

traveler. In like manner official salaries, though not increased in amount, became heavier upon those who, through taxation, paid the salaries. Since prices have been rising the reverse has been true, and the fixed charges in the way of debt, interest, rates and salaries have been more easily paid. If a change in the volume of the money is made deliberately and intentionally, those who make it are morally responsible for the injustice done, and they must be prepared to show that, all things considered, the change secures a larger measure of justice, or a nearer approximation to justice.

I have not mentioned the subject for the purpose of criticising those who have endeavored to enlarge the volume of currency, or those who have endeavored to contract it; I have referred to the matter merely to show that through monetary legislation it is possible to take money from one man and give it to another, and it follows that unless this legislation is based upon sound arguments and the laws made in the interest of justice, the taking may not only be wrongful but the injury very great.

The ideal monetary system would be one in which the purchasing power of the dollar remained the same yesterday, today and forever. Then business could be done upon a level plain, and no one would secure that legislative advantage which, whether it be great or small, is necessarily attendant upon a change in the average purchasing power of the dollar. In 1896 bi-metallists contended that an enlargement of the volume of the currency was necessary to protect society

from the effect of falling prices, an effect recognized by all civilized countries in the various international conferences that were held. It was admitted that in the restoration of bimetallism there would be instances of individual injustice, but it was contended that the restoration of a just level of prices would, on the whole, promote justice. Those who at that time defended falling prices and complained of bimetallism are today using the arguments of bimetallists and pointing out the fact that the dollar which rises in value, like a dollar which falls in value, brings injustice to some.

Surely in the consideration of so great a subject as that of money, care should be exercised to reduce to the minimum the injustice done and to increase to the maximum the stability of the dollar as a measure of the value of all other property.

The subject of private monopoly furnishes us another illustration of larceny, and here it is not petit larceny nor even grand larceny; it rises to the proportions of a glorious larceny, not only because of the amount taken, but because of the respectability of those who receive the stolen goods. The object of a private monopoly is to control the price of the thing sold; it is to corner the market. The theory is that man's necessities require him to buy certain things which sustain his life and add to his comfort. Where there is competition the sellers bid against each other and the purchaser is able to secure what he needs at a price which is approximately fair. If, however, all of the vendors can be brought together in a combination, so that all purchasers must buy of the same vend-

or, competition is eliminated and the man who fixes the price, fixes it arbitrarily; and we know enough of human nature to know that he is apt to charge all that the traffic will bear. To illustrate this point, let us suppose a city in the midst of a desert whose people derive their water supply from a single spring. All must have water, and they must have it no matter at what cost. If the one spring to which they all must go is owned by an individual and he is permitted to charge what he will for water, he is sure to prosper as long as there is any money in the city. This is an imaginary case. It cannot be real, because the instinct of self-preservation is so strong that people would not permit the water supply of a city to be in the hands of one man with no regulation as to the price to be charged. In the cities which permit private corporations to control the water plants there is always provision for regulation of the price. I need only present the case of a real monopoly to show how intolerable it is. A monopoly is as abhorrent to the public as a vacuum is to nature, and yet, we have allowed monopolies to grow up in this country which do far more injustice, and reap a larger profit from the injustice, than the owner of the spring would in the supposed city in the desert and these monopolies are tolerated only because the people are less informed about their methods and their influence.

I insist that the commandment "Thou shalt not steal" applies as much to the monopolist as to the highwayman, and we shall not make any national progress in the protection of the people from private monop-

olies until we are prepared to obliterate the line that society has drawn between the ordinary thief and the larger criminal who holds up society and plunders the public through the instrumentality of private monopoly. The man who stands by the wayside and, holding a revolver to your head, demands your money or your life is no more a criminal, measured by every moral standard, than the man who, obtaining control of a nation's fuel, collects a tribute from every householder, offering him the alternative of payment or suffering from lack of fire. I have mentioned a monopoly in fuel, but a monopoly in light, in food or in any other necessary of life is just as repugnant to the moral sense. It is entirely possible that very many of those who enjoy the benefits of monopoly—some as managers, some as directors and some merely as stockholders—are unconscious of the principle involved—unconscious of the moral character of their conduct, but surely this is an opportune time to impress upon the conscience of the nation the real moral character of the conduct of the monopolist.

And it is not sufficient that we shall appeal to the conscience of the monopolist alone. If a highwayman were to engage a lawyer to follow a few rods behind him with a horse that he might have a ready means of escape after having committed an act of robbery, we would call the lawyer a party to the crime and we would visit upon him the same punishment visited upon the principal in the robbery, and so if someone living near the spot where the robbery was committed furnished the robber with a change of clothing

or, in return for a part of the booty, conspired with him to conceal the booty until suspicion was past, such a one could not escape legal responsibility for the crime; and yet, it is considered quite respectable today for the legal representatives of predatory wealth to visit state capitals and national capitals and prevent the enactment of laws intended to protect the public from private monopolies; and it is even more respectable for the salaried attorneys of these monopolies to follow close after the offenders and furnish them horses in the way of legal technicalities upon which to escape from punishment. And some of our metropolitan papers are in the same class with the unscrupulous lawyer. Is it not time to raise the moral standard and to insist that our laws shall be made for the enforcement of human rights and not for the protection of those who violate these rights? Shall we continue to be horrified at housebreaking and the picking of one's pocket and yet view complacently and without concern these million-dollar raids upon the earnings of the entire population? Surely we are justified in applying to the trust question the commandment "Thou shalt not steal."

And will I be entering upon forbidden ground if I question the moral character of those financial transactions which have resulted in the issuing of watered stock and fictitious capitalization? The individual cannot circulate his note unless the purchaser believes that he has back of it sufficient property to insure the payment of the note, but there is a presumption in favor of stock issued by a corporation. People assume

that industrial stocks represent their face value. If a company is formed with a capital of a hundred millions, the investors assume that that much money has been invested in plants and in the business, and dividends are expected upon that basis, but this supposition has been abused and the people have been imposed upon. All sorts of devices have been employed to give to the stock the appearance of genuineness. Eminent financiers underwrite the bonds issued by the corporation, or subscribe for large blocks of stock and thus lend their names to the schemes for the exploitation of the public. A few years ago it was found that one of the high officials in a prominent New York bank was connected with a company which was inflating the value of certain stocks by what is known as washed sales; that is, by the selling and re-selling of stock among a group of men for the deception of the public, and when the matter was made public, the bank official seemed unconscious of the moral turpitude involved in the transaction. Stock which does not represent money invested cannot be raised to its face value by honest or legitimate means, and those who palm off spurious securities upon the market may make more money by such transactions, but they show no more conscience in their transactions than the horsetrader who doctors up a worthless animal and by concealing his defects sells him to some unwary purchaser. I hope I shall not be thought guilty of impropriety in suggesting that the commandments which are binding upon the rest of the world ought not to be suspended in the region of Wall street. If

we were able to make an exact calculation of the amount of money taken from an unsuspecting public each year by the issue of stocks and bonds known to be worth less than the amount for which they are sold, we would probably find that the total amount of money stolen in this way is larger than the amount stolen in a single year by all of the criminals who have been sent to the penitentiary during the year for petit or grand larceny.

Even in the fixing of rates (not to speak of discriminations and rebates) railroads and franchise-holding corporations may be guilty of an extortion bordering on theft. These quasi public corporations are under obligations to furnish an adequate service at a reasonable rate and anything in excess of a reasonable rate is simply so much taken without right from those who are the victims of the extortion.

And now, at the risk of being accused of sacrilege, I venture to introduce to the stock exchange the commandment which we have been considering. I am aware that here in New York the stock exchange is regarded with a certain amount of veneration and that many who vehemently denounce gambling in a back room where winnings and losses are small, remain strangely silent in the presence of the enormous games that are played upon the stock market, often with loaded dice. Gambling is one of the worst of vices, and gambling in stocks and in farm products is the most destructive form in which the vice appears. Measured by the number of suicides caused by the New York Stock Exchange, Monte Carlo is an in-

nocent pleasure resort by comparison. Measured by the amount of money changing hands, the contrast is still greater in favor of Monte Carlo; and measured by the influence upon those who do not gamble, the evils of Monte Carlo are insignificant when compared with the evils of New York's commercial gambling houses. The New York Stock Exchange has graduated more embezzlers than Fagin's school did thieves. When a group of men gamble at a wheel of fortune or at a game of cards, the injury done is confined to them and to those immediately dependent upon them, but those who gamble in the grain pit or on the floor of the Stock Exchange deal in commodities or securities in which eighty millions of people are directly or indirectly interested. Farm products are juggled up or juggled down, stocks are boosted by the bulls or depressed by the bears, and the whole country feels the effect. The natural laws of supply and demand ought to regulate prices but these laws are entirely suspended when a few men can by their bets add millions of dollars to the market value of one product or take millions of dollars from the value of another product. After a crusade which convulsed a state and at last impressed the thought of the nation, we got rid of the Louisiana lottery and then we congratulated ourselves upon our virtue. The men in charge of the lottery never did a tithe of the harm that the grain gamblers and the stock gamblers of New York do every day, nor did they ever exercise anything like the corrupting influences over politics. It has been asserted without denial that ninety-nine per cent

of the New York purchases and sales of stock and of produce are merely bets upon the market value, with no intention on the part of the vendor to deliver, or on the part of the purchaser to receive. This is not business; it is not commerce; it is not speculation; it is common, vulgar gambling, and when to the ordinary chances that the gambler takes are added the extraordinary chances due to the secret manipulation of the market by those who are on the inside, the stock market become worse than an honestly conducted gambling resort. If a man takes a chance upon a wheel of fortune, he knows just what his chance is, and he knows that the owner of the wheel has a percentage of chances in his favor, but when a stranger gambles upon the stock or grain market, he is at the mercy of those who, by obtaining control of the visible supply, can destroy every natural law or business rule which the outsider knows. While the laws of each state and the laws of the nation should prevent, as far as laws can, the use of these commercial activities for gambling purposes, there must be back of the law an educated public opinion, and I beg the spiritual advisers of our great cities to consider whether they cannot advance religion as well as morality by pointing out that the commandment "Thou shalt not steal" is openly and notoriously violated in the stock market and in the grain pit by those who profess to believe in the Bible and to have respect for its teachings.

If time permitted I would call attention to the adulteration of food which sometimes involves a vio-

lation of the commandment against killing as well as the commandment against theft.

But law finds its foundations in morals, and back of wrong doing is a false conception of life. I have not exhausted the field of illustration; I have not applied my text in all the multitude of ways in which it can be applied, but I shall conclude the discussion for this time by calling attention to the fundamental conception of life that more than anything else is responsible for the various forms of larceny to which I have referred. In our haste to make money we have cultivated the impression that life is to be measured by its income and that men are worthy of respect in proportion as they have accumulated. If I were delivering a religious address I would insist that life should be measured by its overflow rather than by its income. I would insist that it is what we put into the world and not what we take out of it that determines the success of a life. But for the present I shall content myself with presenting an economic standard rather than a religious one and say that the only economic rule for accumulation is that one shall draw from society in proportion as he contributes to the welfare of society. Forms of government, methods of administration and legislation all should have for their object the securing to each citizen of the rightful and legitimate rewards for his toil. Society cannot say to a man that he must as a matter of religious duty give more to society than he takes from society, nor can it without violation of individual rights say to a man that he must give to society more than he gets

from society. The citizen owes a certain obligation to the government, and the government owes a certain obligation to the citizen, and these obligations are equally binding. The government can have no favors; it cannot put the burdens upon some and offer the rewards to others. The best government is that which furnishes to each citizen the most perfect security against every arm uplifted for his injury and which, in so far as it enters upon a co-operative work, distributes with equity both the burdens and the benefits of that co-operation. Perfection is not to be expected in government but the desire for perfection ought to control the citizen in his civic work as it controls him in his own life. Jefferson taught this conception of government when he insisted upon the maxim, "equal rights to all and special privileges to none." Lincoln had this purpose of government in mind when he said at Gettysburg that those who assembled there should resolve that "a government of the people, by the people and for the people should not perish from the earth," and Jackson gave expression to the same thought when he said in one of his messages:

"Distinction in society will always exist under every just government. Equality of talents, of education or of wealth, cannot be produced by human institutions. In the full enjoyment of the gifts of Heaven and the fruits of superior industry, economy and virtue, every man is equally entitled to protection by law."

"But when the laws undertake to add to those natural and just advantages artificial distinctions—to grant titles, gratuities and exclusive privileges—to

make the rich richer and the potent more powerful; the humble members of society—the farmers, mechanics and the laborers—who have neither the time nor the means of securing like favors for themselves, have a right to complain of the injustice of their government.”

The “swollen fortunes,” against which the President justly inveighs, almost without exception find their source in special privileges and in governmental favoritism which legalize injustice; it is not strange that the “humble members of society” complain, but it is strange that conscience does not more often restrain the “rich” and the “potent” from asking for such unfair advantages.


The nearer we can make government conform to the divine plan, the nearer we shall approach justice, and according to the divine plan the reward should be proportioned to the industry and the intelligence with which one labors. With the great mass of mankind this must remain the only basis of rewards, and those who in the pulpit, on the platform, through the press and in legislative halls assist in the creation of public opinion should labor in season and out of season to present an ideal of life that will make each individual as anxious to render faithful service to society as he is to draw an adequate compensation from society.

The commandment: “Thou shalt not steal,” will not have the weight that it ought to have among men until it is so construed as to bring the feeling of guilt and shame to those who draw from the common

store more than they add in service. If we can but create a sentiment which will make men ashamed, not only of wrong doing but of idleness as well, and fill them with an earnest desire to make generous return to society for all the blessings that society confers, it will be easier to prevent those varieties of larceny which are so difficult to define and which the officers of the law find it hard to detect and punish. [*From an address delivered at Carnegie Hall, New York, February 4, 1908, under the auspices of the Civic Forum.*]



LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 013 763 336 A ●